

BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. I.—MARCH, 1861.—No. 2.

ARTICLE I.

THEOLOGY, OLD AND NEW.

"Nulla novitas absque injuria ; nam presentia convellit."

"Every novelty does some hurt, for it unsettles what is established."—

Bacon.

BUNYAN, at the opening of his "Pilgrim's Progress," has crayoned for all time the outlines of the Old and New Theologies. Evangelist, in the old way of the apostles, points the conscience-stricken pilgrim to the wicket-gate and the shining light, putting the parchment-roll into his hand. But after travelling a little way, Christian is met by a Mr. Worldly Wiseman, from the very great town of Carnal Policy, who tells him of a new and pleasanter way.

Worldly Wiseman. But why wilt thou seek for ease this way, seeing so many dangers attend it? Especially since (hadst thou but patience to hear me) I could direct thee to the obtaining of what thou desirest, without the dangers that thou in this way wilt run thyself into. Yea, and the remedy is at hand. Besides, I will add, that instead of those dangers, thou shalt meet with much safety, friendship, and content.

Christian. Sir, I pray open this secret to me.

Worldly Wiseman. Why, in yonder village (the village is named Morality) there dwells a gentleman whose name is Le-

gality, a very judicious man, and a man of a very good name, that has skill to help men off with such burdens as thine is from their shoulders; yea, to my knowledge, he hath done a great deal of good this way; aye, and besides, he hath skill to cure those that are somewhat crazed in their wits with their burdens. To him, as I said, thou mayest go, and be helped presently. His house is not quite a mile from this place; and if he should not be at home himself, he hath a pretty young man to his son, whose name is Civility, that can do it (to speak on) as well as the old gentleman himself; there, I say, thou mayest be eased of thy burden; and if thou art not minded to go back to thy former habitation, (as indeed I would not wish thee,) thou mayest send for thy wife and children to this village, where there are houses now standing empty, one of which thou mayest have at a reasonable rate; provision is there also cheap and good; and that which will make thy life the more happy is, to be sure there thou shalt live by honest neighbors, in credit and good fashion.

Here are the two theologies, the Old and the New, standing out on opposite headlands. But it is a great and common mistake to suppose that the difference between them is always so distant and apparent. If it were, the peril to voyagers would be vastly diminished. They approach each other by a thousand almost imperceptible changes and interwinding channels. It often requires considerable time to tell on which side of the fatal boundary certain small crafts, drawing shallow water, are sailing. The deep, safe channel is wholly upon one side, and is straight and narrow. Beyond it is a broad bay, filled with moving, drifting quicksands.

The Old theology is God-given, apostolic, and ever the same. The New is always changing. It is Arian, Pelagian, Socinian, Arminian, in ever varying composition, according to times and circumstances, constant only in its carnal policy. It came to be called Heresy, from its constantly *choosing* its way. The primary signification of *apertus* being option, choice. It always seeks to cover and deny its real nature, and claims to be the Old in a little pleasanter dress. For a time it may employ the language and symbols of truth with mental reservations or cautious modifications. It is this its chameleon adaptability which gives

it its greatest power to mislead. And the chief and most difficult work of the guides of the Church, in every age, is to discover it through its new dress and behind its new combinations, so stripping and exposing it as that all real Christians may see its deceptions and deformity, and turn away with abhorrence and fear. Robust and keen-sighted heresy-hunters are needed, not more because there are wolves in the mountains than that there are wolves in sheep's clothing secreted in the folds of the flock.

In every age, the doctrinal investigations and discussions of the great men of the Church (and it was chiefly this that made them great and greatly useful) accomplished the desired end for their respective times. But as vanquished error continually puts on new phases and comes back into the bosom of the Church to renew its gradual perversions and divisive work, there arises constant necessity for new and varied applications of the same unchangeable principles of the Gospel, which, like Ithureal's spear, quickly unmask the old deceiver.

Church history shows that no defences and demonstrations of truth, however amply they may avail for one age, are sufficient for the ages that follow. It was not enough for the Reformers to point their contemporaries to the writings of the Christian Fathers. It would not answer for the Puritans to rest in the works of the Reformers for the purity and power of religion. No more shall we be safe in this age by simply republishing and gathering into our libraries the invaluable writings of the theological giants of a century ago. Timid reviews which simply reproduce the long and heavy, though strong and learned arguments of the previous century, have little point or interest for our times. They do not meet the skilful dodges of the present. As plausible rogues succeed in counterfeiting every successive vignette of the best banks, so the language and symbols of genuine religion may be copied, and come to represent only a new, bankrupt, and ruinous theology. There must be for every generation of Christians a fresh brightening of the links of the irrefragable chain that anchors the Church to the cross of Christ. And for this necessity we shall find the fullest reason in the apostate character of the race.

Bacon nowhere gives greater evidence of deep penetration than when he says, "Ill, to man's nature as it stands perverted, hath a natural motion, strongest in continuance; but good, as a forced motion, strongest at first. Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator; and if time of course alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"

Of course, time can be an innovator only as it furnishes a perverted race, to which "ill hath a natural motion *strongest in continuance*," opportunity to work out its gravitating tendencies. "Good, as a *forced* motion," may be "strongest at first," and so produce powerful reformatations. But the reformatations being accomplished, the natural tendency to evil remains and is forever operative up to the final "restitution of all things." Hence much of the work of Christians in the world is special and periodic; it is like lifting against gravitation, or building against decay.

In theology there is this special reason why "good, as a forced motion," is strongest only at first. The fundamental doctrines of Grace require a warm and living *faith* in order to receive and prize them. It is only when a person walks by faith, near to the unseen world and the spiritual God, that he can receive implicitly and submissively those divine teachings which lead out beyond the grasp of sense and reason. Hence it is not necessary to class all who, for a time, manifest latitudinarian predilections, as the open and avowed enemies of God, or even as really unregenerate persons; though ignorance of, and repugnance to, the cardinal principles of the Gospel system must ever constitute a prominent mark of the unrenewed state. Members of the Church, real Christians, yea, Christian ministers may fall into and warmly advocate gross errors, as they may practise enormous iniquities, and yet be, like Peter and David, real Christians. A low and declining state of piety, and feeble experience at conversion, paves the way to the undue exaltation of reason, to dangerous speculations, and to carnal policy. Partial instruction, early prejudice, deference to majorities, or the adverse influence of asso-

ciates and friends, may lead numbers to exercise charity for, and ally themselves with, the secret enemies of the Gospel, and thus to lend their influence, more or less consciously, to those who undermine and destroy the divine system of Grace, more effectually than do the open and avowed enemies of the sacred Scriptures.

Hence it comes to pass that in almost every successive generation of Christians, there is found a new and spurious theology struggling with the old for the mastery. The struggle will be severe and the issue disastrous according to the strength with which plausible error is allowed to entrench itself within the Church before the alarm is taken. And "it is natural to man to indulge in illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to that siren till she transforms us into" Arminians. And Arminianism is the natural state of the apostate race. "For ill, to man's nature as it stands perverted, hath a natural motion, strongest in continuance. . . . And if time of course alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"

As we look back over the history of the Church, we cannot fail to notice two things sure to occur as definite sequences. First, new errors spring up after a period of inactivity and low piety, just as diseases throng to prey upon the system after a period of feeble vitality.

When the Church is weak in faith, walks much by sight, and is conformed to the spirit and policy of the world, then is she surely hatching a callow, clamorous brood of new theologies, which, in time, is as sure to create division and strife as God is sure to recover his Church from utter apostasy. Second, a more or less thorough and sifting discussion of the beginnings and first principles of Christian faith is sure to accompany or speedily follow reviving spirituality and new Christian activity and power in the Church. And when the recovery comes, it is complete and thorough. The Church comes wholly back to the same old, divine theology of Paul, of Augustine, of Calvin, and of Edwards. "Good, as a forced motion, is strongest at first."

Soon after the great revivals which began on the day of

Pentecost, we find the apostles entering upon the most thorough arguments and proofs to establish the doctrines and instruct and confirm the multiplying disciples in them. When we examine carefully, we find most of the epistles devoted to this vitally important work. The younger ministers are charged to "give heed to the doctrine," to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," to "lay hands suddenly on no man." The most discriminating and close tests are given and applied by which to detect false doctrine and expose false teachers; so close, indeed, as no doubt to call forth the ridicule and abuse of those who could not bear the tests, "which say they are apostles, and are not." The churches were strictly and repeatedly forbidden to listen to, harbor, or give any encouragement to those professed teachers who were not squarely and unequivocally on the *one, old* platform; so jealous and watchful were they for the truth. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 10: 11.) "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1: 9.) And after all, when the revivals began to cease, how soon the churches began to relapse into errors that tended rapidly to utter perversion and apostasy.

So also after the commencement of the Reformation in Germany, England, and France. How different would have been the results to the world without the discussions and systematizing labors of the persecuted and maligned Calvin and his coadjutors of that period! No mind but God's can compute the saving, healthful influence of that one book, the "Institutes"; and yet it was regarded in its time as a wanton, malicious, and "divisive movement." It went like a piercing sword through the churches and through the hearts of the advocates of new and popular roads to Heaven.

Again, after the Great Awakening of 1740, what a mighty work was necessary to be done by Jonathan Edwards and the lesser lights who succeeded him, in rooting out the new and false theology which had been growing in the Church and eating out its piety like a deadly cancer. And yet, Edwards was viru-

lently hated by a portion of the Church and ministry, and maligned as a heresy-hunter, and as originating a divisive movement. The half-way covenant which cost Edwards such a fearful battle and so many wounds to destroy, was but the natural progeny of Arminianism which had been creeping slowly back to the heart of the Church through all the long period of decline which preceded the Awakening. There is significance for our times in the fact that one of the greatest works of Edwards he entitles, "Inquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notion of that Freedom of Will, which is supposed to be essential to Moral Agency." In this work he annihilates, for that generation of Christians, such notions of free will as rendered necessary the rejection of original sin and efficient grace; bringing the Church back once more fully to the one unchanging faith, which is so clearly and powerfully condensed from the Scriptures into the Savoy and Westminster Confessions. Then, for a time, "had the churches rest and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied."

But, alas! ere fifty years had passed away, the piety of the Church, under the commotions and engrossing excitements of the Revolution, sadly declined, and there began to appear new theology in the form of Arian or Unitarian Arminianism. Political preaching may have availed much in the struggle for liberty, but it was at a tremendous sacrifice of doctrinal truth and thorough religious instruction. This apostasy from Pauline and Calvinistic truth began very mildly. For years there were many good men who strenuously denied that there was any essential departure from the old faith; and this was the rock on which many friendships split, and around which many separated in sympathy and labors, slowly bidding each other a regretful adieu.

At first this new theology was like Bunyan's By-path Meadow, which led along by the King's highway so near that for a distance Christian and Hopeful could see no diverging. And as the Narrow way just there "was rough, and their feet tender by reason of travels, . . . they wished for a better way. . . . When they were gone over [the stile], and were got into the [new] path, they found it very easy for their feet; and withal,

they, looking before them, espied a man walking as they did, and his name was Vain Confidence: so they called after him, and asked him whither that way led. He said, to the Celestial Gate." But after they had gone on pleasantly for a time, and it began to grow very dark, their leader fell into a deep pit, from the bottom of which they could get no reply but a groaning. Then said Christian, "Who could have thought that this path should have led us out of the way?"

So has it ever been with the various introductions of Arminianism. For, though Arminianism was introduced into the reformed churches by James Arminius, it did not originate with him, nor remain as he left it. The same views, substantially, were introduced by the semi-Pelagians in the fifth century, and by the Molinists, and Jesuits in the Church of Rome. They all began by apparently slight modifications of the doctrine of original sin, and proceeded, by degrees, to unlimited free will, (or power of contrary choice, as it is termed in our day,) and to predestination as founded upon previous knowledge and consideration of the merits of the elect. The followers of Arminius, after his death, deviated much farther from the common doctrines of the Reformation than he did. And, as Dr. Alexander of Princeton states with peculiar clearness and force, "this is what commonly takes place in all similar cases. The man who first calls in question received opinions does not wish to appear to recede too far from the creed of the Christian community with which he has been connected; and all the necessary consequences of his opinions may not be obvious at first; but by discussion the system in all its bearings becomes more manifest; and a man's disciples are found to be more ready to extend his principles to all their legitimate consequences than he was. And in regard to all errors, it has been remarked that their tendency is downwards; the adoption of one error commonly prepares the way for another still more erroneous. Thus the leaders of the Arminian party in Holland approximated much nearer to Unitarianism after the synod of Dort (1618) than they had done before, and professed and publicly taught doctrines which, it is believed, Arminius would have rejected with horror."

Precisely so was it in the lapse to Unitarianism in New Eng-

land. At first the Calvinistic doctrines were not rejected, but generally dropped out of preaching, as rather rugged, and well enough known already. Nor were they dropped formally and avowedly, but by common, tacit consent. Some who exhibited them occasionally, did it apologetically, and as if they were of very little consequence. There are men now living who remember to have heard Dr. Osgood of Medford, and such as he, preach these distinguishing doctrines quite fully, and then, at the close, tell their hearers, in substance, "These are the truths which the Bible seems plainly to teach; nevertheless there are many good men who think otherwise, and I leave you to receive or reject them as you may feel inclined." This first stride downward being taken, the way grew more and more precipitous; and when they had passed away, their churches proceeded to settle avowed Unitarian pastors over them, constraining small minorities to withdraw, rebuild, and, under great disadvantages and bitter reproach, fight the battle anew for the primitive faith and piety.

Who were the divises of that conflict? Is disease or remedy to be ranked as the detested invader? For that was not a causeless, or a trifling battle. Then, for a memorable period, the strife and tumult, as often before, resounded. Then was heard the clangor of arms, the wail of the wounded, and the shout of the victors, mingling in mournful discord, as Jehovah sifted out, and led back his humbled followers to the original Puritan standards from which they had so wickedly and perilously departed. Again the Spirit was poured out, as in Pentecostal times; the great benevolent societies were organized; and the revivals of 1832 and 1837 stimulated the increasing sacramental hosts to unheard of activity and zeal.

But along with this unwonted activity, it was but natural that there should come new perils to truth. It produced a hot-bed growth of evangelists, revivalists, reformers, and laborers for immediate effect. It engrossed the mind with external appliances and onward progress to the neglect of, or out of proportion with, deep, scriptural cultivation of the heart and the appreciation of first principles. It has accustomed the Church to such great and rapid changes as to expose us to the danger of the most debauching and reckless radicalism, that

of loving the *excitement* of change, and desiring novelty for its own sake; for radicalism in religion lays the foundation for radicalism in politics and all reforms.

Again the time seems to have come when many ministers and churches are looking about, like Christian and Hopeful, for some smoother way than the rugged old path, and some are already climbing over the stile into By-path Meadow. That there are, at the present day, tendencies to new and dangerous forms of Arminianism, we think, cannot be overlooked by those who are prepared to examine candidly, being free from selfish, partisan, and entangling friendships and alliances, and "who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." That it will be generally seen and admitted before it gains firm and bold possession, is more than can be expected, according to all the history of its repeated incomings. We think it can and should be boldly met and resisted *now* in its beginnings, and thus much of the bitterness and disaster of rupture and division be *prevented*. But always the encroachments of error have been doubted, denied, and the very idea scouted, until it has strongly entrenched itself. While, on the one hand, we would be the last to excite needless alarm and jealousy, on the other we would lift up our voice against that false and lazy charity, and that fatal delay which will not believe in the existence of an enemy until it has quietly taken our fortifications and turned our own Columbiads upon us. If we must err, let it be on the side of safety, rather than on the side of ease and quiet. It were better that an aggressive army, like the Christian, should be aroused by a false alarm, to set double watch, to send out scouts, and to make thorough examination, than that they should be overtaken in determined sleep and dreamy safety. The success of Wellington, as he advanced into Portugal and Spain, is attributed chiefly to his caution and prudence in making impregnably secure every position behind him.

We do not intend to indicate all the present signs of New and divisive theology, preferring that Christians should be stimulated to open their eyes and look about them. Having fresh before us the past plausible and treacherous modes of the entrance of great errors, in the place and garb of truth, as Satan

entered Eden, we will delay the reader only with the briefest mention of a few particulars, chiefly for the purpose of calling special attention to them. And we will begin by referring more specifically to that unwillingness to make, or allow of, faithful examination, which was strongly hinted at but a little above. If the ministry and churches are all abiding substantially in the Old theology, why is the alarm so readily and violently taken so soon as the proposition for faithful investigation of doctrines is made? How easily the whole Church might be convinced and satisfied by encouraging and facilitating the inquiry, if there is felt to be really nothing to conceal. Is it not the surest sign of the incipient demoralization of an army in an enemy's country, if they not only refuse to be watchful, but also pour contempt and ridicule upon, and even forcibly silence, those who would be watchful? It was Flatterwell that led the pilgrims, by a road which turned away by small degrees, until they fell into a net, and then "the white robe fell off the black man's back, and they saw where they were." "A man that flattereth his neighbor spreadeth a net for his feet." (Prov. 29: 5.)

But there are other and more positive signs of the New theology in the Church. It is well sometimes to consider what the avowed opposers of the Calvinistic faith think and say of us; for they, standing on the outside, have advantages and are often keen observers of important tendencies and changes which are hardly noticed by the busy actors within the Church. According to the Arab proverb, "It is better to have a wise enemy than a foolish friend." From a score of similar extracts we select the following portion of a letter by Rev. Thomas Starr King, written in San Francisco, on the first of January last, to the Hollis Street church of Boston, on the occasion of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the dedication of their church-edifice.

"But the need for our movement is obviated just as fast as a more rational and savory interpretation of the Gospel is furnished from the popular Church. Where the Westminster Confession is commended in its grim strength and dreary symmetry, there is pressing need of a distinct liberal organization. But where Henry Ward Beecher preaches, there is surely far less need of it. In a community where the *Puritan Recorder* furnishes the type of theological teaching

and the mould of character, there *must* be a liberal Christian Church ; but not so certainly in a district where a spirit, as in the junior pastor of the Old South, is the medium of Orthodoxy. Let the Athanasian creed be poured into the community through the soul of an Episcopal clergyman warped into its likeness and a vital organ of it, and a Unitarian Church will spring out of the ground near it ; but let a man like Rev. Mr. Maurice fill the Episcopal structure with his thought and charity, and there will be very little pressure to organize a hostile theological demonstration. And it is because the methods of interpretation within portions of the Sacrificial Church have been changing, and the mould of character enlarging, that the Unitarian and Universalist movement has not met a far wider visible success.

"There is need for us yet, as a distinct, and to some extent *combative* party. But our mission is to hasten the time when *the Church in general* shall modify her creeds, and grant more freedom to thought, and organize more charity, and receive again into fellowship the needful forces which her narrowness has spurned."

He could have given no higher praise of "The Boston Recorder" as an efficient agency in withstanding infidelity, and the friends whom it represents should take note of it and be multiplied by thousands. But what must we infer in relation to two opposite papers of the denomination ? Surely they, and the ministers mentioned, are, in his opinion, but representatives and leaders of a large class in the Trinitarian Congregational Church, who are furnishing "a more rational and *savory* interpretation" of the Gospel, and making progress towards the so-called Liberal, or Broad Church. And we have very many proofs that Mr. King is but imprudently speaking out the convictions of hundreds and thousands of the haters of what he calls the Sacrificial faith.

It cannot fail to be seen that many of the Arminian "notions," which Edwards found it necessary in his day to combat so boldly, and which were thought to have been forever refuted, are now again finding numerous, and more or less outspoken, advocates among the leaders and instructors of the Church. Then, as commonly in these periodic struggles, the battle raged around those great doctrinal centres of original sin, and efficient grace as related to free will, which bear so direct and necessary an influence upon all our views of the Atonement, Regenera-

tion, and Decrees. So now, a minister boldly assaults and claims to have overthrown the positions of Edwards's great work on the Will. And straightway he is promoted to a Theological Professorship where he may secretly, that is, unobserved by the Church, instil his peculiar and divisive notions into the minds of our future ministry. And here we are bound to take warning from the immediate past. For, though Taylorism, as a system, may now be said to have been repudiated, yet it has left its poisonous influences in the minds of a multitude of pastors, tinging all their preaching with the un-Edvardian and preposterous opinion that, after all, God foresees conditions in certain individuals, or at least conditions *ab extra* to his own mind, on account of which He elects them; and also, that a heart alienated by nature, as the leopard's skin is spotted by nature, can be changed, new-created, by merely suatory power!

Again, it cannot be denied that new and "more savory interpretations" were desired when two new congregational papers were forced into being at vast expense and sacrifice, and a divisive and sectarian movement was thus inaugurated, filling the churches and the land with bitterness and strife. The editor of one of these papers has frankly confessed his position to be that of a compromise between Arminianism and Calvinism. And the editor of the other, in his recent lecture in Boston, on Jonathan Edwards, as we understand him, attributes the peculiar theological views of that great man very much to his deep piety and peculiar education!

Moreover, the strong and clear views of Edwards and Calvin on Original Sin, the satisfaction of divine justice in the Atonement, and the source and ground of Faith, seem to be stumbling-blocks in the theological instruction which was thought once to have been so strongly and doubly committed to the Westminster Confession and unequivocal Calvinism. Many of the old terms, so much employed by the great men of former times, such as Imputation and Substitution, are greatly qualified, set aside, or ridiculed. And if the professor emphasizes the expression, "Sin consists in sinning," it is not wonderful if the young preachers sometimes go forth apparently with the high ambition of convincing the churches that they have been

befooled by the old-fashioned preaching, and that they are not guilty of Adam's sin! We have known three of them, in speedy succession, before the same congregation, to make this the burden of their cheery, disenthraling song. What can be the aim of all this unless it is to imply that there is no other Scripture sense of sin and guilt but that which is strictly personal and literally voluntary? and that there is little or no meaning in such passages as these: "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." (Eph. 2: 3.) "The carnal mind is enmity against God." (Rom. 8: 7.) "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." (Rom. 5: 18, 19.) Yea, we have heard a very popular preacher, on the text, "Come unto me all ye that labor," &c., tell his impenitent hearers that they should not expect, at this day, to feel the deep and pungent convictions for sin which were formerly common, since the offers of mercy were now made so plain, and were so well understood, that no one could separate them in his mind from the conviction of ill-desert!

Thus the New theology flows naturally from the seminary and newspaper fountains, through all the streams, and into all the gardens of the Lord. It is no wonder that church creeds are so often, of late, stripped of their Calvinistic articles, and the innovation openly justified by the argument that creeds were only designed as tests of incipient Christian character, and not as outlines and standards of Scripture doctrine. No wonder the distinguishing principles of the Gospel are so little preached and understood! No wonder the old-fashioned invitation to the sacrament of the Supper is now so often modified to include all that choose to consider themselves Christians! No wonder there is such a readiness to welcome into church fellowship, and to patch up hopes for the doubting ones who cannot conscientiously say that to them, "Old things have passed away, and all things have become new"! It is but the carnal policy, more or less distinct, of Mr. Worldly Wiseman in opposition to plain old Evangelist. He would not indeed have Christian go back to the City of Destruction; neither would he have him encounter all the perils, reproaches, toil,

and conflict of a pilgrimage in the old straight way. He would have him, by all means, send for his wife and children and live in a pleasant respectable way in the beautiful village of Morality in the great town of Carnal Policy.

In fact there is nothing but a return to, and a faithful application of, the homely, outspoken, primitive theology of the unchanging Bible which can rescue the Church from the mournful laxness of discipline which is now opening wide the doors of the Church to the world, and thus virtually turning the Church out of doors. Nothing but this God-given and Heaven-blest old way of the Fathers that can correct the prevailing, insane desire for exciting, showy Union meetings, and for superficial, Union literature which dilutes the Gospel and debauches the taste of the Church, leading it to clamor for the preaching which will draw, like a theatre, the masses of the people.

It is not true, as is so flippantly said, that the churches sufficiently understand the distinguishing and controlling doctrines of the Gospel; and the shepherds will have a solemn account to render therefor. What Christian understands enough of Christ and his Cross, which is but another expression for the whole cluster of Christian principles, and which alone the Apostle determined to preach and teach? Disguise it as we may, it is a fearful sign of the prevalence of new and perverting theology that multitudes in the churches are profoundly ignorant of the teachings of the Scriptures concerning the divine way of justifying lost sinners. Though there are no themes so interesting to healthy and vigorous minds, we ask what proportion of the congregations, or even of the churches, can give you any clear definition of what is meant by Regeneration, Justification, Adoption, and Sanctification? How many can enumerate the divine attributes, and not be stricken dumb when told that they believe three persons to be one person, and one God to be three Gods? How many can converse intelligently about the office-work of the Holy Spirit, the ground of the Christian hope of Perseverance, or the state into which the race fell by the sin of our first parents? And if these and their kindred subjects are so poorly comprehended, what hope may we reasonably indulge that Christians will stand fast, when new and plausible errors spring up, and that they will not be "carried about by every wind of

doctrine"? What hope that, ere long, we shall not have, in every church, the talkative Mr. By-ends with all his numerous relations; "and in particular my Lord Turn-about, my Lord Time-server, my Lord Fair-speech; also Mr. Smoothman, Mr. Facing-both-ways, Mr. Any-thing; and the parson of our parish, Mr. Two-tongues, was my mother's own brother, by father's side; and to tell you the truth, I am become a gentleman of good quality; yet my great-grandfather was but a waterman, looking one way and rowing another, and I got most of my estate by the same occupation."

The last evidence of our drifting from the old standards which I shall mention, is found in the common confessions of church-members. The very mention of the themes of the Shorter Catechism in the presence of young, excitable America, creates laughter and ridicule. Imagine the Apostle Paul to arise and to go into our bookstores, our counting-rooms, our shops, and seriously introduce the doctrines which the early Christians so loved; and how quick the lip of the fast Christian of our day curls with sport or with scorn, while the author of the Epistle to the Romans turns pale and trembles with amazement to hear, "Why, you do not really puzzle your head with, or read on, these subjects nowadays, do you? Why, these old doctrines are dead and buried long ago. Nobody studies the Catechism now. Does your minister preach on such subjects? He must be two hundred years behind the times. There is but here and there an old foggy who cares a fig for that kind of Christian literature. It is extremely unpopular even in Puritan New England. Why, Sir, you are not awake to the times in which we live. Mind is active, ministers must be wide awake or they'll be left behind. Everything goes by steam now. We do not go to heaven in the lonely, slow, and toilsome way of former ages. They have a railroad, Sir, and go in cheerful crowds by steam, and have a good social time of it too. That old slough of despond has been entirely filled up by the liberality and public spirit of this wonderful age. The wicket gate was a very narrow and bigoted entrance, Sir; and it has been greatly widened and beautified. Bunyan's old friend, Evangelist, who used to give each Christian a roll to carry and to examine with so much care, is

now ticket-master, who gives to each passenger a neat card which he has only to hand to the conductor, Mr. Smooth-it-away. Instead of having to carry our bundles on our back, according to the ridiculous old fashion, we deposit them safely in the baggage-car, and receive checks as security that they shall be restored to us at the end of the journey. Yea, we have even persuaded Old Apolyon, who used to give such annoyance to pilgrims, to be our engineer, and a capital one he makes too. The famous Hill Difficulty, Sir, is tunnelled right through; and when we pass, as we do now and then, one or two of the obstinate, old-fashioned, grim pilgrims, who still persist in going the old way, our wide awake engineer puffs steam in their faces, to the great amusement of the happy passengers."

Surely, "Time is the greatest innovator; and if time of course alters things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"

ARTICLE II.

WILL FUTURE PUNISHMENT BE MERELY THE RESULTS OF NATURAL LAWS?

WE confess to "heresy-hunting" in this article. The charge often made is true of us in this endeavor. We hear and believe that the bulls of Bashan have come even unto the mountains that are round about Jerusalem. We have ourselves seen where the boar out of the wood has broken down the hedges, and wasted the vineyard of the Lord. With a frank avowal of our purpose, zeal, and expectation, we enter on the chase.

We confess, also, to an effort in this article for "a divisive movement" among the churches to such an extent, if possible, as to separate between the older theology of New England and certain modern innovations, called "improvements," in the condition of the lost. And if we succeed in bringing back

into favor some doctrines, "older than any now extant" in many pulpits, we shall have gained our end. We hope also to create and strengthen "demands for more stringent measures to guard the old Theology."

There is not a greater question now agitating the pews, the pulpits, and the theological world, than the condition of the impenitent dead. Something of piety, but far more of carnal reason and a deranged philanthropy, and most of all the restless enmity of the convict against the law, are moving a discussion of this question. The interest felt in it is wide and profound, and such anxiety is there in some evangelical quarters to break away from old fastenings, that the strain on creeds and ordaining councils is very great. The doctrine of Calvin, Edwards, and Griffin on this question, is not now popular and acceptable with many who call themselves Calvinistic and Edwardian. There is a feeling growing up with belles-lettres scholarship in the pulpit, and refinement in the congregation, that such a doctrine does not harmonize with the humanities and philanthropy of the age. It is esteemed abhorrent from a refined and tender piety. So it is suppressed by the preacher, while he gives attention to "practical" topics. He does not eject it from the creed of the church. That would alarm the older membership and suggest universalism. The dogma is retained, but as a country-parlor, that is never opened and aired for use. The doctrine is qualified and compromised in various ways. Some invent, as Olshausen in his "Commentary of the New Testament," so common and popular with the younger ministry, a second probation, and so lay broad ground for universal restoration. Some confound disciplinary with penal suffering in this world, as the author of *Nemesis Sacra*, who pleads for retribution here, and by a confused philosophy spreads the outlines of hope for the ungodly in the world to come. Others, perplexed by the vastness of the idea of everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, come out boldly for the annihilation of the wicked.

But the less suspicious and more agreeable form of weakening and wasting this doctrine of future retribution, is to limit and qualify its mode of administration by confining it to the action of natural laws. Thus God is withdrawn, positive punishment is

withheld, and the lost soul is left to suffer only the sad effects of a violated constitution.

The show of the older theology is kept up by a continued use of its terms. So the hearer is not left to suspect the orthodoxy of his minister. He gives to the language of the sermon its ancient import, and a meaning beyond the intent of the author. What Hilary said of Nicene hearers under Arian preachers is worthy a repetition in this connection, and is pertinent to many of our congregations. "Sanctiores aures plebis, quam corda sunt sacerdotum." The ears of the audience are more pious than the hearts of the preachers. Great labor is expended in analyzing the moral constitution to show the executive ability of conscience to punish, and great rhetorical effort is made to set forth the punitive visitations of conscience. All this is well in its place and to its measure, but does not exhaust, or at all meet, the import of some fearful passages in God's word.

Yet it keeps up the appearance of preaching the old doctrine of everlasting punishment. Less of philosophy and rhetoric and more of close exegesis would show that all the forces and action of natural laws cannot answer to "the wrath of God" against a lost soul.

And what should lead us in advance to distrust this theory of future punishment by natural laws only, is, that it is quite acceptable to restorationists. They have held it longer than those modern speculators, who would soften and polish for gentle ears the rough orthodoxy of Edwards. The restorationists feel at home in this theory, and see its strong points and irresistible logical inferences for a final and universal salvation without an atonement. So they accept it from orthodox pulpits as a flag of truce and promise of a compromise.

But we pass on to mention some of the objections to the theory.

By the term, natural laws, as used in expressing this theory, we understand the constitution of the man, physical, mental, and moral; and by the results of natural laws we understand the legitimate action, development, and fruit of this constitution, God doing no more than to sustain the conditions of being. For illustration, Ananias and Sapphira received the

results of natural laws in their shame, fear, and remorse for their sinful act. According to the old doctrine of divine punishment God superadds to all these natural results, special, positive visitations for sin. Ananias and Sapphira received such in their unnatural death. So the old theology teaches that in the world to come there will be suffered by the lost, not only these terrible inflictions through a violated constitution, but special, positive extra-natural judgments immediately at the hand of God.

§ 1. On the theory in question it may be remarked, first, that future blessedness will be more than merely the results of natural laws. The body of the saint will vastly exceed in worth his present body. Though this present one is in many respects glorious, it will be a "vile body" in comparison with the other. That will be fashioned like Christ's glorious body, and adapted to a state of things infinitely exceeding the present. The outer life of the saint, the surroundings, that will correspond to our abode here, will also be wonderfully changed. It will be the New Jerusalem. Such an abode must have much to do with the happiness of the saint. This is a part, and no small part, of those heavenly excellencies of which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor heart conceived. Yet all this is no fruit, or development of natural laws.

The social life of the saint, the aggregation of all the holy, both human and angelic, the concentration in daily life of all the virtues and social excellencies that have ever adorned the Church of God, or the world, — this must have a most important connection among the causes of the blessedness of the saint. But it is a supplement to any and all the results of natural laws. Grace, working with the natural laws of the regenerate soul, may fit it for so glorious a body, and abode, and society. But those laws do not furnish either, and so cannot be said to furnish the blessedness that comes through them. This is an extra or foreign addition at the good hand of God, who by the laws of creation and of grace has given the body, abode and society of the saint. Heaven is no outgrowth of the individual. It is not a development, as from the chrysalis into the winged state. The candidate for heaven has a gracious adaptation begun in him here for that higher and perfect grade of being. But no system of natural laws, working under his present

constitution, can furnish that higher grade, or promote him to it.

Reason, Scripture, and our own fond anticipations, as the children of God, lead us to look for far more than the present constitution and course of nature would legitimately give. Heaven we judge to be something more than natural. We look on it as special, positive, arbitrary, among the provisions of God, nearer to a new creation than an outgrowth of the old.

The same line of reasoning holds good with reference to the lost. They are to have a new body, new abode, and new society and social life. All will be in another grade of being and for another purpose too. They were in probation. That is now ended. God has finished his endeavors to reclaim them, and to elevate them to a higher and holy life. They now enter on retribution. For this the new body, abode, and society are adapted. And though the natural laws of the man, as hostile to God, would, in their results, make him wretched, so far as they acted, they could not produce the extent or intensity of suffering that the Scriptures group under the word hell. The perdition of the ungodly appears from the Scriptures to be as much supplemental to any natural results of a sinful heart and life, as heaven does of a holy one.

And, moreover, when we consider the revealed account of that new body, abode, and society for the saved and for the lost, we cannot avoid the conviction that the present natural laws of the man, as they affect his body and mind and soul, will be totally inadequate for his government in that so new order of things. The changes in him and in his circumstances will be so great that evidently there must be Revised Statutes. A new system of natural law would seem to be demanded by this new order of things. And it is a fair presumption, as well as a sound exegesis, to assume, that when God, after the general Judgment, says, "Behold, I make all things new," he means to declare a new order of life, bodily, social, and moral.

So we cannot predict with any certainty or fulness of account, what and how much will be the blessedness of the righteous, or suffering of the wicked in the world to come, from what we know of the present happy results of virtue, and of the miserable results of vice, according to our constitution.

§ 2. God has punished in this world, over and above any results of natural laws. The government of God in this world serves a double purpose: the subjection of man to a rule of right through cheerful obedience, and a revelation of the policy by which he will control those who will not yield such obedience. This last use is made by illustrations. They are prophetic samples of an eternal policy. The Deluge, the destruction of the cities of the Plain, the plagues of Egypt, the overthrow at the Red Sea, the death of the company of Korah and of Sennacherib, are examples of terrible, positive punishment. They were inflictions of judgment, independent of any results of natural laws. In them God appears personally. The ordinary channels of avenging justice are set aside, and he miraculously visits with his own right hand. As miracles serve the purpose of confirming the truths of revelation in general, these serve as exponents and confirmation of his policy of punishment. They are as decisions in a Supreme Court that interpret a law and settle a principle. By these we learn that it is consistent with the benevolence and in accordance with the policy of God to punish men positively, capitally, and with no regard to their reformation or benefit. We see by such cases that he does this arbitrarily, or by extra and special interposition, and without the intermediate instrument of natural law. Then there is nothing improbable in supposing that he will punish in the world to come independently of any action and result of natural law. Nay, that he has done it here teaches us to expect that he will do it there. We must take these cases as expository of certain well-known passages in his Word: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." How tame this truth, and how emasculated of all vigor, if we render it according to the theory we are considering: "It is a fearful thing to fall under the results of natural laws." "Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord." "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Heb. 10: 30, 31; 2 Thes. 1: 8.)

No penal visitations of natural law answer to the import of such fearful words. They foretold the avenging hand of God

on his final enemies. They send our thoughts backward to the waters of Noah and the smoke of Sodom, and forward to that dreadful day when he shall visit the wicked with "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish." They make one thoughtful of the terrors of the Lord, and beget a certain fearful looking for of that judgment when the wicked "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation."

§ 3. The theory of punishment by natural laws alone destroys the governmental connection between sin and punishment. They are made to stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. A natural and self-executing law joins them. God does not appear as a legislator, except in creation, when he formed the constitution of man, and in the giving of the law. Nor does he appear as a governor in punishment. He comes no nearer to a personal administration of government than to keep in existence and in natural action the subject who is undergoing punishment. The theory dispenses with his personal presence, activity, and superintendency in the distribution of justice. He appears no more personally than in the processes of physical laws. But for our living and moving and having our being in him, this entire government by rewards and punishments would move on without him. Neither the condition of the saved nor of the lost would require his interposing hand. Rewards and punishments would come as natural fruit, and constitute heaven and hell.

In refutation of such a notion it is enough to say, that it does not allow for that personal superintendence of God in all his moral government which the Scriptures assign to him. It excludes a personal and individual estimate of human acts, and an accurate adjustment of award to the merits of each. When we think of it, the idea of mechanism, and of a machine so perfect as to be left of its overseer, intrudes itself. But the Biblical view of God's moral government surrounds us with God, and fills in between all our thoughts and acts with his personal inspection. Instead of awaiting the fruits of natural law, the child of God is led to feel, when he departs this life, that he is going to receive an inheritance "reserved in heaven," "which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Peter, 1: 4.

1 Cor. 2: 9.) And the same Scriptures lead the dying sinner to look forward to visitations, dispensations, and afflictions, not developments. He does not carry perdition with him. He goes to it as Judas went to his own place. The cold, impersonal process of cause and effect, as shown in the action of natural laws, does not fill out this scriptural idea of reward and penalty at God's hand.

§ 4. On this theory one may abate all punishment by ceasing to violate his moral constitution. His penal sufferings are the results of violated natural laws. Under the discipline of a sorrowful experience he may gradually refrain from these violations. A rectifying of the character and a restoration of its moral tone would ensue. The violations would be wider asunder, till they ceased wholly. Then the natural results of them would cease, and punishment be at an end. It is true that in this case the moral man will remain weak and debilitated, as the result of his sins, but he will be no longer an active transgressor. He will be restored and promoted, though in the end only a heavenly invalid. And so with the premise of this theory, where is the logical difficulty of establishing the doctrine of universal restoration? Indeed, this theory is the foundation of this doctrine. It begins by separating between the transgressor and God. It leaves him to suffer for sin, as he suffers pain for an injury to the body, through a self-executing law. The pain leads him to a study of his physical organization, and so he is led to guard against further injuries to it. And so, understanding, healing, and protecting his bodily constitution, he becomes his own savior. This theory sets the violation of moral law, and punitive suffering for it, in the same light, and the moral constitution is to be treated in the same way. God is not regarded as immediately concerned in the results of natural laws as a punishment for sin. Self-executing laws impose the suffering. If a man would escape it, he must study his moral constitution and show a careful obedience in the light of the law of God. If he suffers for his transgression, God is no more to be consulted than when he has violated some physical law and suffers for it. In the whole process God is kept at a distance. And if the man goes into the next world, suffering for sin, he must adhere to his former

policy,—study his moral constitution and the moral law, and then seek a more careful obedience; and this he must continue to do till he attains to a perfect knowledge and a perfect obedience. That will be his salvation, his heaven. In all which the carnal heart is gratified by keeping God aloof, escaping positive punishment, and being independent of Christ, as a vicarious saviour.

§ 5. This theory does not allow an adjustment of punishment to the measure of guilt. According to it the laws of the moral constitution are the executors. Conscience is the main force for the administration of penalty. But conscience is a power more or less efficient in proportion to its proper culture. It may become a dwarf or a Hercules. In this world it is usually the case that the least guilty have the most efficient conscience, and the most guilty have the least efficient. And as the fruits of culture, both virtuous and vicious, are carried into the next world, it is difficult to see why the relative power of conscience will not hold there which was attained here. If so, then the greater the abuse of the moral constitution here, and the more terrible the drugging and deadening of conscience by a long and dark course of crimes, the less will be its avenging power hereafter. So punishment will come in the inverted order of demerit.

If it be said that conscience will be enlightened and quickened in the world to come, we must remember that all consciences will share alike in this respect. And as one star differs from another star in glory, these different consciences may keep up their relative proportions of power, though the efficiency of each is augmented. So the inferior conscience of the superior sinner may retain its relative inferiority and inefficiency, and the man suffer but little punishment comparatively, because he has been so great a sinner as to palsy the arm that should punish him.

§ 6. If it be true that the punishment of sin is found only in the results of natural laws, how can offences against the public welfare and the commonwealth of God be punished?

No man liveth unto himself. He is a member of society. He may so sin that the evils of it will lie much or mostly within the circle of his own interests. Now, admit for the time

that he may receive punishment for this sin through the results of natural laws. But he may so sin that society shall be the principal sufferer. What means of redress, or of maintaining, by government, its welfare, has society? According to the theory in question it may have no special laws of its own, and visit this offending member with positive punishment. Society must be passive in its suffering, and contented to see the guilty one punished merely so far as the results of natural laws may act penally. This whole idea of punishment by natural laws only, when we take it back from the future world, and put it into practice in every-day life around us, is a comedy on law, a burlesque on government. Here is a joint-stock company. The shares are a hundred thousand. A member of the company owning one share commits a trespass against the company by which the value of its entire stock is reduced one half. As a result of the laws natural to the company, this man is punished in the loss of one half of his one share. Does he deserve no more than this? It is only a hundred thousandth part of his desert. And the company, that is the great sufferer, has as yet had no redress. Has it no rights to be maintained? Has it no duty to perform in punishing this wrong? Yet, according to the theory we are examining, the stock company may inflict no positive punishment. The man must be left to suffer so much, more or less, as his one share is depreciated by his trespass. Enlarge now the property held by the company. Let it embrace all the interests, pecuniary, civil, social, moral, and religious, that are gathered in a commonwealth. Change the name from stock company to civil society. And now look at the trespass, the transgressor, and the punishment, according to this theory. It is ultra, obsolete, and exploded non-resistance. This theory, brought home for our practice, unhinges all prison doors, remits all penalties and fines, resolves the courts into advisory bodies, and the judges into exhorters, and leaves civil government, remodelled and made naked, with one right and one duty, as the body of its constitution—the right and the duty to let everybody alone. If a man sins against society, or rather, it should be said, against this inorganic human mass, he must be left for punishment to the constitution and course of nature. No punishment, positive, special, *pro re nata*, may be visited on him.

The same line of argument holds where the offence is against the divine government. When a man sins against God, he does more than merely to injure himself. It is a breach against the perfect and glorious government of God, and it is an injury to the universal society under that government. To the same extent, therefore, that he has injured the commonwealth of God in its government, or subjects, or both, to that extent does he deserve punishment. It is conceded that, as an individual under that government, he suffers through his moral constitution for the wrong he has done. But evidently such suffering bears no greater proportion to what he merits than he does, as one person, to the multitude whom he has injured. Now if this suffering through his moral constitution, this effect of natural laws, be all the punishment he receives, how is the character of the Lawgiver sustained, and the majesty of his government honored, and the welfare of its injured subjects vindicated? Indeed, this theory of punishment that confines it to the evil results of sin, as they recoil naturally on the transgressor, seems to overlook or ignore the fact that sin is far-reaching and wide-gathering in the sweep of its terrible consequences. Take the first sin of Adam. Will his experience of the results of violated law answer to the claims of justice against him for all the terrible consequences of that sin? If this theory of punishment be correct, then the claims of God and universal society against the sinner on trial will be ruled out as claims having no foundation in justice. Then, under the government of God good men have no rights that bad men are bound to respect; and he who wishes to sin may count the cost by foreknown and probable natural consequences.

§ 7. If it be true that the punishment of sin lies inclosed in the results of natural laws, how is an Atonement possible?

The atonement of Christ is made by his vicarious or substituted sufferings. By these he becomes the end of the law for our justification. He satisfies the law in its demands on a sinner, so that it urges its claims no further. It comes to an end of its demands in him. Now suppose the atonement applied savingly to a man. What punishment is averted or cancelled by it? According to this theory there is no positive punishment in the future world. And if none there, in "ever-

lasting burnings," we do not certainly look for it in this world. This is a world of probation till death. The sinner here has not been tried nor any verdict rendered. Positive punishment there, cannot be found for the atonement to avert. Does it, then, cancel or avert the punishment that is found in the mere results of natural laws? But a natural law is imperative and inevitable in its action, except as overruled by a miraculous interference. Yet the atonement does not secure its saving results by a miraculous application. It cannot reach that punitive result of natural law to stay it, except as the nature be deranged or destroyed in which that natural law has a home, and to which it marks out a mode of action. Therefore, on the theory of punishment now under examination, an atonement for sin is impossible. It would be as reasonable to speak of an expiatory sacrifice to prevent the pains and inconveniences that attended the loss of the ear of Malchus by Peter's sword. Such pain or inconvenience is inevitable, imperative. It must come. Nothing but a miracle can stay it. Hence it is not surprising that denominations who take the view of punishment in question, Unitarians and Universalists, reject the Atonement. They reject it logically, from these premises: if the position that the punishment of sin is found merely in the results of natural laws, is correct, we have no need of an atonement; if made, we cannot use it; and to be rid of it is to be rid of an inconvenient and useless dogma.

§ 8. If it be true that the punishment of sin lies thus inclosed in the results of natural laws, then Pardon is also impossible. And for the same reasons, in the main, that have shown an atonement to be impossible. Pardon cannot be applied, on this theory, except as it interferes with the relations between cause and effect. Were punishment *positive*, God could withhold it; but being the fruit of natural law, he cannot avert it except by suspending, deranging, or destroying a natural law. Suppose that a man, in the heat of passion and of hate towards his family, cuts off his own hands that he may not be able to provide for that family. It is a great sin that he has committed, and he is now enduring punishment for it in the results of natural laws. But at length he truly repents, and God pardons this sin. What penalty is remitted? He suffers, and will till he

dies, the results of violated natural laws. Pardon does not reach the man, and cannot, till we admit that positive punishment from God impends. That is what is remitted, and in that way pardon takes effect. And so we see that nothing less than an impending, positive punishment can make an Atonement or Pardon possible.

§ 9. If future punishment is merely the results of natural laws, the General Judgment would seem to be an unmeaning ceremony. For according to this theory the transgressor comes under sentence, and under the endurance of penalty, so soon as he sins. He goes under penal suffering to the Judgment, and into it. He goes through the Judgment, and on beyond indefinitely, suffering only at the hand of the same avengers that punished him before he was tried and sentenced. And though he is sentenced at the Judgment, the sentence not only adds nothing to previous penal inflictions, but it does not make future suffering any otherwise in certainty or kind from what it would have been had there been no Judgment. The trial and condemnation at the great day do not vary the nature, mode, or extent of punishment. And so the sinner glides through that scene unaffected as to his punishment, except so far as any renovation of mental and moral powers may give him better views of his sins, and so severer chastisement by conscience.

What, then, is the sentence of that Great Day of God but an empty ceremonial? A punishment is pronounced in most solemn and impressive form. Yet it adds nothing, varies nothing, from what the guilty one was about to suffer without any sentence. And what kind of a tribunal or condemnation is that which sentences to the suffering of merely the results of natural laws? It is as if a human court should try, convict, and solemnly sentence a criminal to endure the natural unhappiness of his criminal life.

And will this view of the Judgment turn guilty mortals to "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversary?" Does such an empty form of trial, and the condemnation to suffer the results of natural laws, answer to the Scriptural account of the terrors of that day, and the fearfulness of outer darkness and the

second death, to which lost souls are doomed? If this theory of future punishment be true, then it must be admitted concerning the description of the General Judgment in the Bible, that it is as a high-wrought picture on canvas, into which inspired painters indeed have wrought divine colors, yet with no prophetic outlines of eternal realities. It is all on the canvas, and none of it in fact.

And yet what is that departing into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels? And what that falling into the hands of the living God? And what that drinking of the wine of the wrath of God? Indeed, the Judgment is more than a reënactment of the laws of nature.

§ 10. This scheme of retribution shows no just appreciation of sin. And this is the vitiating, fatal error that underlies the whole structure. Sin is esteemed as mainly a mistake in the management of self-interests. The theory does not rise up and go out after sin, as something committed against God, and as doing violence to infinite justice and benevolence and wisdom, as combined in his glorious government for the good of the universe. The punishment is not commensurate with any such view of the wrong to be avenged. There is a narrow, provincial lingering of judgment among the private interests of the transgressor, as if he had wronged himself only. The measure of evil and of guilt is sought mostly within the selfish circle of the sinner's own welfare. Thus, the consequences of his sins are dwarfed to diminutive proportions, and the punitive inflictions are diminutively commensurate. The theory makes sin to be little more than a personal oversight, to be followed naturally by personal inconveniences.

We have been surprised to hear evangelical preachers, so called, say that one sin would not justly expose a man to everlasting punishment, perhaps not all the sins of this life. But when they adopt this theory of retribution, the surprise ceases. For evidently a man ought not to be punished forever, with positive inflictions at the hand of God, for one mistake, or for any number of mistakes, in his own private affairs. In the reflected light of such punishment as this scheme advocates, sin can be little else than a blunder. It is an act that shocks the moral constitution of the actor. This is unfortunate, for the

personal consequences are annoying. If the evil be not corrected, it will follow one into the next world and trouble him there for a season. So a remedy must be sought. The process of it is mostly preventive and restorative through the personal management of the suffering offender. All which shows no such guilt as demands an infinite sacrifice. Then the nature of the penalty is such, wrapped up in organic laws, that it cannot be met by substituted suffering and a vicarious atonement. Nor can the punishment be stayed by pardon. It is of the quality of a natural effect and must follow its cause.

How far these views of future retribution accord with the older symbols of orthodoxy, needs no statement. They are a compromise for peace between two antagonistic systems; and the compromise is all on one side. It is a retreat from the high ground of Calvinism toward the natural level of a universal restoration. It is a facile and covered descent to lower regions, while it would seem to remain unmoved. It is a removal of the cross by showing that its use is impossible according to the moral constitution of man. Of course we are to be called alarmists in this thing, animated by a purpose to provoke controversy, thrusting unpractical speculations on the evangelical world, making "a divisive movement" where there is no disagreement practically, and much more. Yet if there is nothing but the old theology extant in our evangelical churches, it can do no harm to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance of the Calvinistic and Edwardian ideas of future punishment.

But what means all this silence in many evangelical pulpits on the positive and unending punishment of the wicked at the hand of God? And what this somewhat speculative, and somewhat tender, pious, and maternal yearning for a second probation? And what this graceful elision of a doctrine dissonant to natural ears from the rounded periods of the fresh and scholarly candidate? And what these lengthy discussions, protracted sessions, and protesting minorities in councils for licensure, ordination, and installation, with sometimes the covering appendix of nepotism? If there is no popular and practical ground for criticism on this question, why the wide-spread whisper through some journals, (amounting to an outcry of alarm,) that nothing is in peril pertaining to the older doctrine

of retribution? This intense affirmation of safety adds much to the evidences of danger.

And what importance are we to attach to such expressions as the following, from one claiming to be an orthodox author? (Rev. C. F. Hudson.) He calls the doctrine of everlasting punishment "the most appalling of all doctrines," and says it "is still a just occasion of offence, notwithstanding the modifications that have been put upon it." "The doctrine retains all its substantial difficulties, and remains infinitely burdensome, notwithstanding all the attempted mitigations of it." "For thinking men, who look at the logical bearings of the doctrine, the full temptation remains to say: 'If this be the religion of the Bible, the alleged truth of Revelation, let my soul be with the God of Reason and Nature.'" Yet he is encouraged by the belief that "the doctrine is almost wholly withdrawn from practical use. Even in our last general revival it was but slightly apparent. It is expected only in the theological treatise, or lecture, or sermon. But thus retained, it retains its whole power of mischief with thinking minds." And he proposes this relief. "Let the distinction between that which is fundamental and that which is not, be plainly made and carefully guarded. On all points not clearly essential, where truth-loving men may honestly differ, let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind. But from the symbol in which, as a psalm of confession, all Christian voices should freely unite, let the burdensome test be removed." It is not too early to have suspicions, and examine the positive proofs of departures from the ancient faith. We remember the cry for peace, and for the culture of brotherly love, and the earnest defence of "practical preaching," when, a half century ago, so many of the churches of Massachusetts went out from us. We confess to the charge. We are "heresy-hunting."

ARTICLE III.

THE THEOLOGY OF PLYMOUTH PULPIT.

THAT Henry Ward Beecher is writing his own name for the next generation to read, there is no one, we presume, who will be disposed to doubt. How they will read, with an increased or a diminished admiration, in characters luminous and indelible, or fading already into a shimmering, it is full early to prophesy. Time makes strange work with the reputation of a people's idols and benefactors, — they are not always identical, — reversing popular verdicts, lifting up the humble and self-forgetful, and dissolving the dreams of the proud, recording its irreversible decree with the coolness of a Rhadamanthus. It is a curious piece of history, and furnishes a study in human nature, the reputation of a living man, and the same man's reputation when he has passed away. In how many cases it is an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, all thinking persons must have observed.

The London *Times* keeps on hand, it is said, a collection of brilliant obituaries of eminent living men, far advanced in years, that it may astonish the world by exhibiting a finished full-length portraiture of a great statesman or philosopher in the selfsame sheet which contains the announcement of his departure. Some twelve years ago, all London was startled one foggy morning to find in the leading journal a most elaborate and eloquent sketch of the *late* Henry Lord Brougham, with a masterly critique upon his genius and character, thus affording to his lordship, who was as well as could be expected for a man of his years and service, the singular gratification of reading what the *Thunderer* had long been intending to say of him after he was dead!

The thing was well enough, no doubt, and might have kept any reasonable number of years, and answered to admiration for a *post-mortem* tribute so speedily ensuing; but the great future has a verdict for every man of renown, which it surrenders at no prophet's bidding. And time is terribly true in this business. When Oliver Cromwell was dead, the Stuart pub-

lished his obituary by setting up his head above Westminster Hall, and thought he had written it "with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever," — "Traitor and regicide, infamous and execrated to everlasting ages!" But two centuries pass away, and Oliver Cromwell looms up a prince among kings and emperors. Two centuries is the measure of six generations; yet the time should not be considered long for the man who carried in his bosom a revolution which disfranchised king and cavalier, and went thundering through the darkness of ages like the chariot of God. It took a long day for the primeval sun to penetrate the dense mists which his own fires had raised. But the business is much more speedily adjusted for ordinary mortals. Twenty-five years ago Daniel O'Connell stood in the front rank of popular British orators. His eloquence was rare, and its finest strains were poured forth on behalf of the poor and the oppressed, while he thundered, like Jupiter, against selfishness, and injustice, and avarice, and falsehood: weeping, as he had been an angel of pity, on the platform of Exeter Hall, when he spoke of the miseries of the West Indian slaves, and making every ragged mother in Ireland believe that he loved her starving child as if he had been its father. But the grave closed over O'Connell; and forthwith, as if waking from a dream, the very community he had entranced proclaimed him jesuit, demagogue, comedian; cold, grasping agitator, whose patriotism and philanthropy were the most miserable of shams.

We are not going to prophesy, neither shall we attempt any analysis of Henry Ward Beecher's peculiar genius as an orator. Our task, more simple, will be, to weigh his claim to the confidence he is so widely challenging, as a theological light to the Churches.

A highly respectable secular journal, whose Saturday circulation is greatly increased by the publication of Mr. Beecher's sermons, asserts that he is a great political leader rather than a theologian. We have it on his own authority, that he chooses to be put in no such category, and to be judged by no such standard. We publish from his own lips, that he belongs to the selfsame class with John, and Peter, and Timothy, and Paul; that his commission and instructions are received from the same Master, and that he proposes to himself the same un-

earthly aims ;— men whose spirit is meekness, and their outer garment humility ; the weapons of whose warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God ; whose shield is faith, their helmet salvation, and their sword the Word of God ;— a very different class of men, as all the world knows, from those who have rejoiced in the turbulent atmosphere of politics, and assayed to regulate the affairs of Herod and Caesar. We remember to have listened to Mr. Beecher, in one of his most brilliant and effective orations, when he asserted, with emphasis, that his calling was that of a preacher of Christ's Gospel, and was at pains to separate that calling from every other, and to claim for it a high preëminence above them all. In a burst of flaming eloquence, he declared that he could not be persuaded to come down from that transcendent exaltation to the poor level of a king, nor yet to the throne, so far higher, of a Michel Angelo. Mr. Beecher, moreover, has chosen his position as an orthodox preacher of the Gospel. It is no narrow procrustean fellowship whose badge he has thus deliberately assumed. There is ample room for the evolutions of the largest genius where Howe, and Owen, and Baxter, and Jonathan Edwards walked at liberty. Is it unreasonable to expect that, for substance of doctrine, in belief and in preaching, Mr. Beecher should be orthodox, if not precisely in the same mode in which any other man has ever been orthodox, at least in some appreciable and honest sense, which shall preclude mistake on the part of the faithful, and be an effectual bar to any plea of sympathy and fellowship on the part of those by whom all acknowledged standards of orthodoxy have always been rejected ?

This is the point which we are chiefly concerned to settle in the present inquiry. The means are at hand in profuse abundance. We shall not need to seek for Mr. Beecher's theological creed in his Fraternity-lectures, nor yet in those multifarious orations, wherein philanthropy and ethics struggle feebly with politics for the mastery. We will go to Plymouth Church, and listen to his Sabbath ministrations, where, if ever, we shall find him, with an earnest, loving heart, preaching Christ's Gospel for the salvation of his people's souls ; thus magnifying that calling which he has affirmed to be more glorious than the throne of a king, or the preëminence of a Michel Angelo. We have

been there often, at intervals not very brief, in time past; and we say, deliberately, that in no single instance have we heard that on which a favorable judgment of Mr. Beecher's orthodoxy could be fairly predicated. We have listened to a very elaborate and brilliant discourse from a text full and glowing with Gospel truth, and, from beginning to end, there was no word which seemed adapted or intended to disturb a sinner on account of his sins, or to show to a sinner who was disturbed, the way of salvation by Jesus Christ. We remember on one occasion, a Sabbath evening, — a vast concourse, including a multitude of the young, being present, — to have had awakened by the reading of the text, in spite of previous disappointments, the expectation of the unfolding of the great doctrine of Christ as the Redeemer of sinful and perishing men. Everything seemed to demand it, — the day, the place, the audience, many of them evidently not especially serious or reverent, and above all the text. How can Mr. Beecher help preaching the Gospel now, we said, and that with a directness and power, which will make this great congregation of sinners against God tremble. Yet the most discriminating thing in all the sermon was the remark, bald and brief, that in some way, all must admit, we are dependent on Christ for salvation. Still we were not convinced, did not wish to be. We held our judgment in suspense. Friends inexpressibly dear to us are among Mr. Beecher's constant hearers and warm admirers; and we had accompanied them to Plymouth Church, not as "heresy-hunters," but with an earnest desire to hear the truth of the Gospel from his lips, that we might pray and hope for their conversion through his instrumentality. We were most willing to believe that the sermons we heard were accidental and exceptional, suggested by some passing incident of slavery, or Hungarian struggle for liberty, or management at the New York Tract House. We gave a hard tug at the law of chances, and stretched it to the conclusion; drew tightly about the trembling loins of our doubt the girdle of charity, and said, resolutely, "Mr. Beecher does assuredly preach the true and saving Gospel to this immense concourse of living men." Now and then, however, and not infrequently, as a discourse from Plymouth Pulpit has fallen under our notice, in the columns of the daily or weekly newspaper,

we have felt a sharp conviction twitching at the girdle of our charity, and the law of chances has contracted with such force as to hold us to the conclusion, that we must have heard from Mr. Beecher's lips, after all, something approximating a fair average of his preaching; nor do we think this could be pronounced an unfair verdict according to all the laws of evidence in such a case.

We have, nevertheless, been at the pains to form a new and independent judgment. We have read, with care, sermon after sermon, for the most part as reported in the columns of the *Independent*; and here we take pleasure to record our grateful recognition of the valuable service rendered by the *Independent*, in thus furnishing to the community ample means for a true decision as to Henry Ward Beecher's theology, and its own. The sermons which we have selected are such as supply the best specimens of the theology of Plymouth Pulpit; in other words, we have taken such as present the preacher in nearest proximity to the fundamental truths of Christianity. The result may be briefly stated. While he plays about those truths continually, and sometimes *appears* on the inevitable path to them, he never preaches them in their scriptural clearness and fulness; on the contrary, he either eschews them altogether, or fatally subverts in seeming to assert them, or boldly and bitterly assaults them with all the force of his rhetoric. Let us see.

There could hardly be a better subject for the development of a preacher's orthodoxy than Christ speaking of himself in his peculiar adaptation to man's most pressing need. Such a subject was the theme of discourse on Sabbath morning, July 22, 1860, as reported in the *Independent* of August 2d. On that occasion, Mr. Beecher stood up in the presence of that great assembly, and read for his text those words of Jesus Christ, — "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." John 6: 51. Need it be said that, in the sublime discourse of which these words are a part, Jesus does not speak of himself at all with respect to his original fulness, as the manifestation of God, and so perfectly adequate to meet all the demands of man's higher nature, but, plainly and incontestably, as the Redeemer, by sacrifice, of men fallen, and perishing in their fall,

to be received by them, for their life, not according to any natural law, but by a supernatural faith; — giving us, as the grand leading idea, a believing or regenerate soul taking hold on Christ as his life. This is the Gospel; and this is the one thing which Jesus Christ has made it the one great and life-long business of the preacher to proclaim, and expound, and reiterate, and urge home to the heart and conscience of dying men; insomuch that everything else, as a presentation of Christ, to a race under condemnation, however it may be true, is a grand impertinence. How clearly and impressively does Jesus tell the Jews, in this discourse, that he will give himself for the life of the world; that they must receive him by faith or perish, and that this faith is a divine thing. Do they stagger at these strange doctrines, and strive to put them away, by a cavil of the natural understanding? Calmly, yet earnestly, he repeats and reaffirms them, — his “flesh,” his “blood,” his resurrection, and his crowning power and benignity in “the last day.” Comparatively dim and unintelligible to their minds then, how did these words of Christ unfold and expand with the current events of his singular history, and especially through the manifestation of the Holy Spirit, — the pouring of noontide on the great doctrines of redemption, which the apostles went everywhere preaching, for the salvation of the world.

In Mr. Beecher’s discourse we find nothing of all this, — literally nothing; but we find, instead of this, what may be accepted, and will be, by anybody who is willing to regard Christ as, in some sense, a manifestation of God, and so bringing infinite resources to the supply of man’s conscious want, as a being of moral sense, affection, intellect, imagination, taste; but who distinctly and totally rejects every idea of the fall and human guilt, and of Christ’s character, as a Sacrifice and a Redeemer.

Now for the proof. Mr. Beecher announces his subject as follows: — “These two ideas I desire, then, to present to you; namely, that Christ is the soul’s true food, and that this food is abundant and inexhaustible.” On these two points, after a series of preliminary remarks, we are thus enlightened — to wit: —

“Every man is born with aspiration. It does not develop in every man. Neither do half the buds in trees blossom. But they are there.

And there is aspiration in every man, whether you suspect it or not, and though it may not blossom. Aspiration means tendril, twining, or anything else by which one vines upward, holding on by the way to whatever will support him. Some plants take hold by winding around, some by little roots, some by tendrils, some by hooks, and some by leaves that catch like anchors. But these things take hold not for the sake of staying where they take hold, but only that they may climb higher. And so it is with men. We clasp things above us by every part of our nature, one after another, not for the sake of remaining where we take hold, but that we may go higher. In other words, when in the ordinary experience of life we gain satisfaction, we do it almost only by feeding on each other. When we attain development, we do that in the same way. The soul feeds on soul, whether for satisfaction or development.

"Now, all the while, this nature is developing, and life is educating it, that it may find its true nature in feeding upon God. What we are doing every day is tending toward that which we are to do when we come to the fulness of our being, and take hold of the soul's real end and final supply — God. This is the final end of every man. Plants do not express themselves as soon as they come up. They *grow* to what they mean in the vegetable kingdom. So do men. They are growing to their final forms. But everything in life is in analogy. Everything is tending upon each lower to develop the next higher — upon matter, passion; upon this, affection; upon this, sentiment; and upon this, Divine love. So men are growing from the seminal beginnings of life through successive steps of years. All through the epochs of men there is regular progression; and this is the end of it: a condition by which they may know how to have such communion with God that all parts of their nature shall find their appropriate supply, their joy and remuneration, in Him.

"There is a correspondent adaptation in the Divine nature for the supply of the soul. It would seem sometimes as though plants that had overgrown their trellis or prop, were reaching after that higher than themselves which they could never find. No man ever outgrew that by which he was meant to be supported. We overgrow relations, we grow higher than our companions. When men set themselves to run up along the walls of their own earthly strength, instead of that by which they were meant to be supported, they are found overtopping their support, and, like some flowers, turning back, and twining about themselves. But no man, when he took hold of God, ever grew beyond, higher or faster, than his support. God did not mean himself for men: he meant men for himself. He created

their necessities with exact reference to his own fitness of supply. Therefore, there is nothing in man that has not its counterpart of supply in the Divine nature."

Here we must take leave to ask, What, and where is Christ in all this? The answer is in the paragraph next ensuing:—

"The Lord Jesus Christ, as the declarative God,—the God set forth in the conditions in which we may understand him,—the God brought near to us,—declares himself to be, and has by thrice ten thousand believing ones been found to be, the soul's true food. That is, there is not one single thing in a man's nature which, if brought into commerce with the Lord Jesus Christ, will not find its development and satisfaction. There is not one element of man's being that cannot be so brought into connection with the Lord Jesus Christ, that intellectually he shall be both developed and fed."

In these extracts we have the substance of the whole discourse; the rest is but the expansion and filling out, with illustrations from philosophy, and art, and poetry, and music,—Socrates, and Plato, and Corregio, and Florence, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and Mrs. Hemans, and Paganini. Passing by some things which have very much of a "New-Jerusalem" sound, and which we confess our inability to understand, what have we but a piece of pure naturalism, which leaves the wide gulph between the fallen soul and God unbridged, ignores the gigantic, overshadowing darkness of human guilt and condemnation, overlooks the sacrifice of Christ, by which man is rescued from the yawning abyss, and makes the aspiration which is in every man take right hold of Jesus Christ, "the declarative God," as though that were all, regardless of what he himself so emphatically says of the indispensable necessity of a supernatural faith.

Are we reminded that no preacher can be judged fairly by a single sermon,—that Mr. Beecher had in view some special end which required just that particular line of remark and illustration, and was never meant to be exclusive of those sublime Gospel-truths with which the text stands connected in the discourse of Jesus Christ? Be it so. Let Mr. Beecher have the full benefit of the suggestion, and let us make further inquiry, keeping still to texts which exhibit Christ in some close relation to the great question of human salvation.

Such a discourse we find reported in the *Independent* of October 4, 1860, on the words, "In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 4: 9, 10. The subject is the love of God, in its wonderful character of flowing forth, spontaneous and free, to sinful man, in and through the propitiation by Christ. This leading idea is presented in the discourse as follows:—

"Love is God's nature. Not that no other feeling exists in him; not that justice and abhorrence of evil are not coördinated with it; not that these do not take part in the Divine administration among men; but that the central and peculiarly Divine element is love, in which all other feelings live, under which they all act, to which they are servants, and for which they are messengers and helpers.

"The passage selected is one that marks this truth. The love which God has for us does not, did not spring from moral excellence in us; and still less do its depth and breadth answer to the loveliness of our dispositions. No man can ponder for a moment the facts in our case, without being obliged to say that God loves men, not so much from the adaptation of human nature and disposition to produce love, as from a Divine nature that overflows from the necessity of its own richness and fulness. The reasons must needs be in God, and not in us." "God did not love man because he had prepared himself, and made himself lovely; nor did Divine love spring forth from any deed of God's. Love springs not from an act; not from a fact of redemptive sacrifice. There is an impression among some that God loved the world after he had sent his Son to die for it; but the Scriptural view is, that his love for the world was the cause of his sending his Son to die for it. The love of God for the world was manifested in that act, instead of being created by it."

Now if Mr. Beecher means to say, that God's love is older than all expressions of it,—the thought and affection of his heart from eternity, primeval spring of Christ's death, and all the manifold riches of his goodness thence ensuing,—he is doubtless aware that he holds this in common, not only with the Princeton Doctors, but with Calvin, Augustine, and all the Fathers. But if, on the other hand, when he asserts that "love springs not from an act, not from a fact of redemptive

sacrifice," he means, as we shall be compelled to believe he does mean, to deny the absolute necessity of Christ's death, as the atoning medium through which that love should flow to sinful man;—if, when he says "love is God's nature;—not that no other feeling exists in him; not that justice and abhorrence of evil are not coördinated with it;" he means less, as we shall find he does, than that the Divine justice is as eternal and immutable as the Divine love, and as dear to the heart of God, so that both must stand or fall together, love being the minister of justice no less than justice the minister of love. If he means that God's love ever had, or ever can have, any expression or manifestation which puts his justice under the very faintest shadow, or which fails to exhibit it in a clearness and beauty equal to its own, then we are constrained to aver that he departs widely from the plainest teaching of holy Scripture, while he diminishes immeasurably the wondrous magnitude, and dims the transcendent glory of the great "propitiation." Could anything be plainer, than that, if all the race was justly under sentence of eternal death, and the Divine love stayed the execution of the dreadful sentence, and opened the way for a full and everlasting deliverance, by an arrangement which commends his justice, not less than his love, this blending of justice and love, in the corner-stone of human salvation, must constitute the great and commanding glory of the redeeming God; while love, in its Divine preëminence, and the vastness of its amplitude, stands not more in its infinite and irrepressible yearning toward men justly condemned, than in the provision according to which men may stand justly free.

This is the very fulness and culminating point of the sentiment expressed in the text:—"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The propitiation for our sins is the main point, the only true and ultimate measure of the love—its "breadth, and length, and depth, and height." And a "propitiation" which consisted in the incarnation, the dread sorrows, and the death of the Son of God, can hardly be exaggerated as to its magnitude and significance. If it had anything to do with justice and law, then it had everything to do. If it met their claims at all, it met them fully.

Such is the obvious Scriptural import of the term "propitiation"; the *ἰλασμός* of the Greeks, which always implied the turning away of anger, a procuring of the favor of wronged and offended Divinity, and a deliverance from justice and holy vengeance by expiation. The term, with its cognates, is adopted by the evangelists in no emasculated sense, in relation to Christ and his death, God and his law, the sinner and his desert. Now unless the justice was real and efficacious, and the vengeance real, and infinite, and eternal, dwelling in the same God with the infinite and eternal love, then it was nothing, a shadow and mockery; and the propitiation was nothing, and Jesus might have been the *æon* of the gnostics, the myth of Strauss, or the poor peccable man of the pantheists and infidels.

If, on the other hand, God "manifested" and "commended" his love, by meeting all the claims of his justice in the *ἰλασμός* proceeding from himself, his "fellow," and "equal," then this great paradox of a love and justice, both divine and immutable, has its strange solution in Jesus Christ; then we are conscious of no contradiction, and require no purblind prophet with his clumsy invention of a "theology of the feelings" to help us out when we sing,

"Once 'twas a seat of dreadful wrath,
And shot devouring flame;
Our God appeared consuming fire,
And Vengeance was his name.
Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calmed his frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
And turned the wrath to grace."

We have noted Mr. Beecher's feeble and halting allusions to man's guilt, the eternal justice of God, and the law—immutable as his love—in which that justice is embodied,—those grand points which stand out with so fearful a distinctness in the Bible, and which prophets and apostles employed with such effect to rouse the slumbering consciences of dead men. He leaves them in a twilight haze, or a mountain-mist, changing, vague, and vanishing.

On the design and efficacy of the "propitiation" we have the following:—

"The plough prepares the field, deeply furrowed, to receive the benefit of the summer sun; but the plough does not make the sun shine. God did not then begin to love when Christ died. His death prepared the human family to perceive, to understand, to be moved by that wondrous love that had gone on glowing through infinite ages, and kindling throughout the universal domain the glorious summer of Divine goodness."

Our readers will hardly need to be reminded that this one-sided view of the atonement, making its necessity all on the side of man, and not at all on the side of God, except as an expression of his love, is greatly in vogue at the present time with those who are seeking to subvert the entire structure of Christianity as an exhibition of the Divine justice.

On the peculiar love of God to his own people, and that mighty transformation of personal character which constitutes the one momentous crisis in the eternal existence of a human soul, a transformation whose magnitude and results no language can exaggerate, and which the Bible exhausts the language of metaphor in laboring to express—"born again," "created anew," "from darkness to marvellous light," "from death unto life," Mr. Beecher thus delivers himself in the same discourse:—

"God's love does not depend upon our character, but upon his own. I do not mean to affirm that it makes no difference whether a man has a good or a bad character. I do not mean to affirm that there do not spring up, between the Divine nature and ourselves, by reason of our relations to that nature, certain deeper and more wonderful affections. But I do mean to affirm this: that there is a great overshadowing love of God to us, that stands, not on account of our character, but on account of his. . . . The Divine love exists and works upon us, not alone when we are conscious, but evermore. Men mount up into the flashes of glorious realization, when it seems as if God then began to love them, because they then first become sensitive to his love. . . . I ask, still further, whether, when a man comes to have a conviction that there is such a God who is his Father, it does not of necessity seem to him that he has passed from death to life; that all things are new; that the world itself is newly created?"

This tendency, in the preaching of our times, — for it is by no means confined to the Plymouth Pulpit, unhappily, — to mystify the great doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and to thrust God's justice far into the background, or to smother it altogether under a blind and dreamy notion of love, is a matter of exceedingly grave import. Is it strange that the enemies of the evangelical faith are pointing, in jubilant mood, to the signs of its decay and coming downfall? Only consent to leave out, or put into a shadowy distance, the justice of God, and you shall find small difficulty in persuading men to embrace all the rest that the Bible contains. Leave out the doctrine of God's justice in preaching, or place it under a cloud, as a grim moloch of the past, and the conversion of men in troops will be an easy achievement. Whether our churches are not being filled up, to a great extent, with the fruits of such conversions, is a question whose solution is hastening.

It will hardly be called in question that we are now in possession of a deliberate and explicit declaration of Mr. Beecher's sentiments as regards the atonement. If, by possibility, there are any who still stand in doubt, we invite them to go with us once more into the great congregation assembled to hear him. The place, in this instance, is not Plymouth Church, but the Music Hall in Boston. The day is Sabbath morning, May 27, 1860. Theodore Parker has died in a foreign land, and the congregation, to which he was wont to discourse, has invited Mr. Beecher to address them from the now vacant pulpit. He does not understand that the terms of the invitation, or the expectations of the audience bind him to the suppression of any religious or theological sentiment in which he may be supposed to differ with them and their late minister. Not at all. He is unfettered and free, and he will make full use of his liberty.

His subject is the "Cross of Christ," and his text that magnificent passage from Paul, commencing, "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel;" and closing with the striking words, . . . "but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolish-

ness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men." 1 Cor. 1: 17-25.

What Mr. Beecher proposes to do, in discoursing on this remarkable passage to the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, he frankly declares in the very first sentence of his sermon. "In this passage the Apostle Paul, with extraordinary courage and fidelity, set forth, against the whole reigning intellectual forces of the world, his faith in Christ." Mr. Beecher, then, is going to do the very same thing: so they understand him and so the event proves. He first takes notice of the fact that the preaching of the Cross in the early days of the Church was a reproach, and explains it; which fact, he asserts, has long since passed away, together with the causes from which it sprung. He then proceeds to inquire for the reasons of Paul's decision and earnestness in preaching Christ in the face of such a formidable unpopularity and opposition. This he finds to be in the character and intent of the sufferings of Christ. On these points he expatiates in the following language:—

"I suppose the Apostle really saw that the secret and heart of God was revealed in the sufferings and death of Christ, and that the character of an infinite God can never be fully made known to us until we have come to understand that God is not an unsuffering, symmetric, calm, central, monarchic Being of perfect pleasure, the eternal recipient of universal honors, — until we come to have the understanding that God is the all-caring, willingly-suffering, self-sacrificing, easily-humbled one. There was, in the Cross of Christ, a testimony of the nature of God, most interior, as of a being that gives self forever and forever, — gives it not as one walking straight upon his own errand, and seeing some one in mischance, would, for a moment, give muscle, and bone, and thought, and power, and then return to his own way, but one whose central idea of everlasting life is to surround and underlay and penetrate things with himself, — to make himself the source of life, not by sitting serene and saying, "Be"! and it is, without trouble, but the central idea of a nature that gives with care and with that sufferance which belongs to a higher nature, — that gives his life while he takes it, that gives it by living in and under and for all things that are capable of suffering, of inspiration, and of love. Not that the crucifixion of Christ was an exigency that was demanded by any particular condition of law, though the law was to be affected by it, — not that the sufferings and death of Christ were necessary by

any peculiar condition of the public sentiment of the universe, though that was to be affected by it,—but that it was to have a revelatory power in respect to the interior nature of the Divine mind itself, and to teach us that our Father God was not one who sat calm and supreme, the most serenely embellished, the most perfectly at leisure, of all the beings in the universe,—but of all workers the most workful, of all sufferers most willing to suffer, if, himself suffering, there was peace and gladness and joy to be given to any of his creatures. . . . And Paul seized that which was the proper representation of this whole thing, namely, the hateful cross of Christ. He says, I shall preach Christ crucified. I shall preach the cross,—namely, that side of the whole life and conduct of Christ, which represents him as suffering, one for another, to do them good. That is the side I shall never give up.”

There is much more of the same tenor, but nothing to modify the purport of what we have heard. Here, then, we have Mr. Beecher's deliberate and explicit confession of his faith as relates to the character and design of Christ's death,—a confession made, as he feels and says, under deeply affecting circumstances, as it is the last time he will address that great assembly, the last time he will see the faces of many of them till he “stands trembling with them in the judgment of the great day.” He is preaching, once for all, to those who have not been accustomed to hear it in time past, and may never hear it again, the Gospel of their salvation. And he preaches Christ crucified, and tells them at the outset that he is going to show them what there is in Christ crucified of such vital importance to the human race, and which constitutes the cross of Christ, the grand and paramount theme of the Christian minister in every age. Yet there is nothing of man's exceeding guilt and danger as a transgressor of law; there is nothing of Christ's having “redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;” nothing from which any one in that listening multitude would even conjecture that there was the first word in the Bible about pardon and justification unto eternal life through faith in the blood of Jesus Christ. But instead of this, what? As he himself sums it up, just this, namely,—“ . . and it is that which, it seems to me, above all other things, our Lord and Master, Christ, came into the world to express,—

to express first, by coming, then by the way in which he lived, to express, as we understand life, character, and conduct, by the way in which he died." And he closed the book and sat down.

The striking peculiarity of this confession of Mr. Beecher's faith is the same that continually forces itself on our attention in hearing or reading his sermons, — the grand and all-pervading Scripture doctrine of Divine justice is either omitted altogether, or dismissed with a passing allusion marvellously fitted to mystify and cover it up.

It is not to be expected that a man whose views of Jesus Christ are so dreamy and vague will apprehend any well-defined ground of religious hope. How should he? For unless Christ is our Redeemer from the curse of the law, and our justifying righteousness, as the Bible represents, what possible ground is there for hope at all? Yet Mr. Beecher sets forth, with much affluence of speech, a religious hope which is sufficient not only for our ordinary needs, but for the most perilous, dark storm of doubt into which the soul can ever be plunged; and its foundation is a cloud-mountain, or the turbulent billows of the sea. His text is those words of the Apostle, as sublime as they are beautiful: — "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Heb. 6: 19. Paul is speaking of the *Christian* hope as having a double confirmation, in the promise and oath of God, both which terminate in Christ alone, who is represented as having entered for us, once and forever, into the true and everlasting holy of holies, which is heaven itself, by the shedding of his own blood. What other ground of hope but this should the preacher present to the beleaguered and doubting soul? But how strangely different are the words which fall on our ear from Plymouth Pulpit:—

"What is the substance of the teaching? It is this: That there is a *trust* in God and a trustworthiness in him, which can hold the soul in every emergency. . . . The confidence expressed here arises simply from a trust in God. It is a feeling which springs up from our very helplessness; it is the feeling that grows strong by the very degree in which we seem to ourselves less worthy and

more weak. It is such a sense of the Divine nature as makes the thought of God just as inevitably a refuge as the sight of a tower or of a fortress to the pursued. . . . Our radical conception of the Divine Being is that of infinite mercy, infinite kindness, infinite love, paternity, embracing — by the very, shall I say structure of his being? by the very necessity of his being — embracing all his creatures in infinite tenderness and kindness. . . . It is this thought of God — that he is inevitably protecting and kind, so that the very word itself suggests help, as the word fortress suggests refuge, — it is this that lays the foundation for this hope and this strong faith. It is the feeling that is peculiarly developed by the interpretation of God's nature, and also by the mercy and love, by the invitations and promises, of the Lord Jesus Christ. For why did he come to seek and to save the lost? why did he proclaim himself the shepherd and protector of the flock? why did he say, 'Come unto me, ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest?' why did he declare, 'Because I live ye shall live also?' why did he say, 'All that the Father hath given to me shall come to me, and no man shall pluck them out of my hand?' unless it was to enkindle in the soul a trust and confidence which no darkness could quench, and no trouble could shake."

There is nothing in all this, if you scan it with care, but "glittering generalities." It is plain that nothing more was intended; nay, that anything beyond was carefully excluded. Let us listen still further:—

"I suppose that every person who has a work of grace that is deeply rooted in him, remembers days and hours at some periods of life (they are more marked than at others) in which there is nothing that it can rest upon. There is just this one thing: helplessness the most utter hanging upon the neck of strength the most august, — a sense of the most profound unworthiness standing before the most profound worth and purity and excellence. . . . These wonderful hours, when touched of the Divine finger, give inspiration to a man's moral consciousness; and when we are pervaded with a sense of our unworthiness, there is but one thing for us to do, to hope in Jesus Christ, and hope simply, or else despair. Not that you understand how he atones and pardons; not that you can see what is the relation of Christ to you. There is no philosophy about it; there is nothing but this simple instinct of hope; we clasp, we hold on to Christ, and say,

‘Thou art my anchor; thou art my safeguard and my surety?’ It is a feeling and not a thought.”

How magnificently the preacher mystifies the doctrines of the cross, and hides the eternal justice of God behind his gorgeous and glittering word-clouds! Let it be carefully noted that all he says of Christ and his teachings and mission represents him only as the unfolding and pouring forth of God’s everlasting love; while any attempt to regard Christ and his death in relation to the law, and to us as under its penalty, is pronounced a “philosophizing,” which has only the effect of untwisting the thread of hope, and is the work of “happy, genial, and hopeful theologians, that think at last they have got up early enough to find out God.” How evident that Paul had never attained to the “work of grace deeply rooted,” of which the preacher speaks!

The doctrine which troubles Mr. Beecher, and puts his rhetoric and his ingenuity continually upon the stretch, is the justice of God. Yet he gravely avers (“Life Thoughts,” p. 187) that he also believes in doctrines, with his “explanations.” In like manner Napoleon believed in the forces that opposed his progress, with *his* “explanations”; which explanations were exterminating cannon, as at Austerlitz and Marengo. But Mr. Beecher’s “explanations” are more fatal even than those of the great Captain, leaving us no smallest remnant of quivering life, nor so much as mummies, but — taxidermy. Hearken! — “Doctrine is nothing but the skin of Truth set up and stuffed.” (“Life Thoughts,” p. 97). The full force and beauty of this metaphor, evidently furnished by Barnum’s Museum, are seen only when it is taken in connection with a common incident in the history of a child. Mr. Beecher was perhaps thinking of the time when he first led his little boy into that grand depository of stuffed skins, and how the child started back in terror at sight of the tiger, and clung to his father’s skirts for protection; and could only be persuaded to proceed on being assured that it was no wild beast, but a “skin set up and stuffed!” We see him saying to himself, “Now that stuffed skin of a tiger is exactly like doctrine in theology, dreadful to a child, but nothing to a man having his senses exercised

to discern." "From the time I was ten years old," he says, in a sermon preached Sabbath evening, Nov. 6, 1859, and reported in the *Boston Evening Traveller* of Nov. 26, "till after I was thirteen years old, the doctrine of God's foreknowledge was a perpetual torment to me. I reasoned in this way: 'If God knew everything from the beginning, he must have known when I would be born, what my nature would be, what circumstances would surround me, and what things I would do; and if what I shall do is fixed and settled, it is no use for me to try to do one way or another.' This doctrine acted as a paralysis on my efforts toward right conduct. So long as I was under its influence, I had a very low experience; — and I suppose that what was true of me, in this respect, is usually true of others."

Will not Mr. Beecher go a little farther into this matter, and make a distribution, so that each doctrine shall have its appropriate designation, — tiger, elephant, or rhinoceros? He might, in this way, construct a convenient piece of mnemonics for those of us who still hold on to the "five points," and so earn our gratitude and that of our children, by telling us just in what particular stuffed skin we are to find the doctrine of God's foreknowledge, in what election, the atonement, and so on to the close.

Seriously, however, we perceive that Mr. Beecher himself is only half quieted by his own figure of speech, like the little child still holding on to his father's skirt, and avoiding too near an approach to that which has excited his terror, yet bravely assuring a playmate who has just entered, that it is not a real tiger, but only a tiger's skin, and so it cannot bite because it is dead! The child is afraid to put his hand on its head, lest, possibly, it should not be dead after all. Mr. Beecher invariably gives an uncomfortable start at the sight of these same "skins of truth"; and more than that, he lays about him lustily with his Hercules' club, as if sworn to be avenged on that which has caused him so much disquietude. A sane man would hardly do so among Barnum's harmless images, even though he might have a thrilling recollection of some terrible encounter with a real tiger in the jungle of Bengal. He deceives himself. There is more to his inevitable apprehension in Christian doctrine than

the skin of truth set up and stuffed. A thing without life could not so much disturb him. Henry Ward Beecher is not a timid man. His neck is clothed with thunder, "he smelleth the battle afar."

We have noted how entirely Mr. Beecher fails to exhibit the true Scriptural doctrine of Divine justice, either passing it by altogether where it ought to stand forth in its full and distinct proportions, or else smothering it quite with his doctrine of universal love. It is simply a matter of course that the doctrine of Divine election will most especially disturb and disaffect him, for nowhere else is God's justice more conspicuous than here. Nobody has any fault to find with the grace of God. Extend the electing love, so that it shall include every individual of the race, and all objection ceases forever. But that God should leave some to the full force of his justice, with the absolute certainty that the result will be everlasting death, herein lies the secret of the opposition. You shall find, accordingly, that the doctrine of Divine justice stands square up in the creed of no man who rejects the doctrine of election.

Mr. Beecher delivers himself variously in relation to this great point, as should be expected, according to his peculiar genius and changing moods, but never with any particular favor; at one time, by the "*presto change*" of his rhetoric, resolving it into a simple human volition, as when he says, "The elect are whosoever will, and the non-elect whosoever wont," ("Life Thoughts," p. 241,) and anon sending it far into the darkness whither no footstep of man should dare attempt to follow, as when he avers that he never preaches election, because he knows not what there is in it, and he will not preach what he cannot at all understand. ("Notes from Plymouth Pulpit," p. 238). We may be quite sure, however, that he is not the man to leave the matter thus. There is the distant sound of his war-trumpet in his words; an encounter may be confidently predicted; and when it comes, the thunder of his charge will be heard afar. It did come on Sabbath evening, Nov. 18, 1860. On that memorable occasion, as reported in the *Boston Traveller* of Dec. 8, he took for a text these words of Paul: "For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will

have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. . . . Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." Rom. 9: 15, 16, 18. From this text he preached to that assembly a most elaborate and highly wrought discourse on election.

He sets about the thing with the air of a man greatly in earnest. All his powers are summoned to the task; he is going to do one of his best exploits. The marvels of his genius in scripture-exposition we do not remember to have seen equalled. Nothing could be plainer than that the Apostle is setting forth the ultimate grounds of the salvation of the elect, which he declares to be, not because they are Jews, not their keeping the law, not foreseen good works, but simply and alone the purpose of God. This point he argues and reiterates, affirming that they who are saved, being Jews, will be saved not because they are Jews, but according to God's purpose of election; and so God in his sovereignty will make a difference between Jews and Jews; and they who are saved being Gentiles, will be saved in like manner. This is the gist, plainly and incontestably, of the text, — the absolute sovereignty of God in the salvation of the elect, and not less in the destruction of those who perish. Yet Mr. Beecher reads the passage and then proceeds directly to combat its obvious teaching, and that with all his might, laboring, with great ingenuity, and with sarcasm, and caricature, and perverse special pleading, to cover the doctrine with obloquy. He does not even attempt any direct exposition of his text, but, having once read it, keeps as carefully aloof from it as if it were red-hot iron, — jumping, first forward into the tenth chapter of the Epistle, and then backward to the second, to find the "key-note of the argument," which he asserts to be "that God had the disposition to save all, and the right to exercise that disposition," Gentiles, as well as Jews, provided they work righteousness, the "love-men" in all the world. Anything must be easy after this. Heer Antony's storm-ship, in the days of old Wouter Van Twiller, sailing directly up the Hudson against wind and tide, was nothing to it. But let us scan his words: —

"The earnest and conscientious of almost all nationalities are apt

to shudder at anything that seems to remove the sense of the inferiority of men that are not of their faith, and that asserts their equality before God. The feeling with which bigoted men of all sects now resent the claims of equality among the warring sects will illustrate the same thing. There are tens of thousands of Protestants who think it almost blasphemy to say that a Catholic will get to heaven. . . . And I apprehend I could find some Roman Catholics who have the same feelings; and then the balance of bigotry on the one side and on the other would be made about equal. . . . Both of them will turn against the Mussulman; while the Mahomedan, with equal intensity of hatred, will defy the whole Christian world. And the Brahmin and the heathen, — they, too, pity the Christian as much as the Christians pity them. Now there is no difference of religion in all the round world that changes this fact that all men are made of God, and he is the Father of every soul; and has, and that, too, according to the inevitable scale of God's mind, a sense of paternity for every living creature on the globe."

Now unless this is intended to subvert the doctrine of God's distinguishing love and its manifestation, it has no meaning. If it does not affirm that no man has any very special ultimate cause to thank God that he is not a Papist, nor a Mahomedan, nor a heathen, it is a very profuse and elaborate way of saying nothing. Let us listen still further: —

"I proceed first to say that God is the Father of the whole human race, not of a particular race or nation, or of particular religions. Whatever is false in all religions, God hates and resists; and a people are none the less the subjects of his moral government, because they may have been born and reared to believe in false gods. I do not mean to leave the impression that before God heathenism and Christianity stand at all upon a par or level. I do not believe any such thing. But I do mean to leave the impression that men, whether under a revealed religion, or under the darkness of heathenism groping in superstition, are alike before God in the most important sense. That we are the children of a common Father, the subjects of his thought, his care, his sympathy, his watching, his providence, and his love. He is not the God of any sect, he is not the God of the Christian sects alone, but of all alike. His peculiar people are not known by creeds, nor rituals, nor worshipping observances. His people are known by their disposition. The pure in heart shall see God, and the love-men in all sects and in all churches are God's men."

The Scriptures teach plainly enough that God is the Creator, the common Parent, and the moral Governor of the race, that he cares for all, protects all, feeds all, and will judge all in the last day. If this is what Mr. Beecher means, he employs a great many words, and much earnestness, in affirming what nobody denies. But he evidently knows what he is about, and he is not fighting with shadows. The Scriptures also teach, with equal explicitness, that God is the Father, in a peculiar sense, of those who truly love him, who have been renewed by the Holy Spirit, and are pardoned through Christ's blood, and justified by Christ's righteousness; that they are the elect, and will be saved; and that their salvation will be owing, not to their "disposition," to their being "love-men," nor yet to God's universal love as it flows forth toward all men, but to his special love, "according to his eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Is Mr. Beecher aware how often he is moved to affirm that he believes in "doctrines," believes in "Divine justice," believes in Christian "institutions and ordinances"? What is the reason of this, except that he finds himself saying that which sounds so exceedingly like a denial of these things? And he is right, his talk *has* a very heretical sound. Neither saints nor sinners would ever suppose, for a single moment, that he believed such things but for these same little counter interpolations of the main drift. They are all that saves him to the ranks of the orthodox! Does he not take us all to be marvelously good-natured? He makes great holes in the gospel-net, and then calls everybody to look while he mends here and there a mesh. Let us mark his phrase:—

"Have you been reared to suppose that you are to be saved by virtue of Christ's mercy, and then that even that will not save you if you wander from the peculiar institutions and ordinances of your fathers? Far be it from me to disown those ordinances or institutions. But I stand in the name of God and affirm that the institutions and ordinances of creeds are not men's masters but their servants. And that man who, without regard to ritual or creed, if he works righteousness,—I stand by the Apostle and declare that man belongs to God's mercy. . . . It is not these outside things in any Church that save you at all. They neither help nor hinder. The

thing that is mighty above all is, that your soul should get hold of God's soul; that your light should be kindled by God's light; your very spirit be in sympathy with and, as it were, a part of the spirit of God. That is the thing that brings relationship, and relationship brings salvation."

This is a sample of what every habitual hearer or reader of Mr. Beecher's sermons will remember, as one of the things so frequently repeated that language fails him for variety. "Church fellowship" is nothing, "creed" is nothing, "baptism" is nothing, "institution" is nothing, "ordinance" is nothing; "these outside things" "neither help nor hinder"; all this and much more, with an occasional "far be it from me to disown." Will he put these things together and tell us, in a few logical sentences, what he means; or would that be inconvenient, as having a definite sense would savor of "system," and so place him directly in the range of his own batteries?

The discourse of Sabbath evening, Nov. 18, 1860, was long and labored; and it had a very particular aim, and that aim pervaded the whole, but was fully apparent only when the preacher approached his peroration. Then he opened his reserve battery with a fury of flash and thunder compared to which even his ordinary warfare is tame:—

"It has been the teaching of some, that while Christ died for the world, after all, the atonement of Christ was limited. If you mean by that, that in its practical operation and by reason of man's fallen nature it is limited, that is, if you mean that men reject the provision offered, and that the boon of atonement is not universal in its blessing, that is a matter of fact. But that is not the idea of many theologians, but that the limit itself is a necessary limit; that in its own nature it affects only a part of the human race. The teaching is that God, from all eternity, selected a certain number of men to be saved; that that number can neither be increased nor diminished; that they are created for that very purpose and destined to that very purpose; and the atonement of Christ was limited exactly to that amount, like a garment well fitted to the body, neither too large nor too small. And they hold that there was another portion of the human race that from all eternity God created and destined to damnation; that he created them on purpose for that; that he created them with just as exquisite skill for suffering as he created others for joy; that they were created for no other purpose than that they might just show forth his glory in

suffering. The idea of God in their system is, that he shows forth his glory in heaven by making men happy there; and shows his glory forth in hell by making others miserable there; that they were fore-ordained to punishment. It still stands upon the records of the Church; there are sentiments like these which have been recorded for years and years, and the paper upon which they are written has not yet rotted; that God made human hearts and strung them with affections, and feelings, and sentiments, and said, I am making these on purpose for happiness, and all heaven rejoiced in the sweet melodies; and he made another heart with affections and feelings and sentiments, across which, when he swept his hands, all hell reverberated with woe. It is said that God did that before men were born, in eternal ages, and on purpose to show forth in their sufferings and sorrows the fitness of his glory. Now if that be God, I defy casuist or logician, or sage or speculating philosopher, to create a devil, beside; I do not know room for one. The capacity of malignity is filled up by such a notion as that; there are no other elements out of which to create a devil that would not be merciful in comparison to that."

Can it be necessary to say to our readers, that this is caricature? We deliberately pronounce it an atrocious libel upon a large portion of the Christian Church. If there is anything in the writings of Theodore Parker which surpasses it in cool, mendacious effrontery, it has escaped our notice.

What did the listening multitude suppose the preacher to mean? As he is fond of shooting at things very far away, did they suppose he was discharging his peculiar thunder at something quite unknown, almost never heard of hereabouts? something existing away down south, or, perchance, in England, or on the continent of Europe? They thought no such thing. They knew, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that their minister was dealing with the doctrine of election, which is taught in our Catechisms, and set forth in the Confessions of Faith of our Churches, and preached by our Alexanders, and Shedd, and Adamsons, and Albros, and Lords.

This sermon brings forcibly to mind a passage in the religious experience of Jonathan Edwards, who had the same early struggle which Mr. Beecher has elsewhere described, but came out of it in a widely different way.

"From my childhood up," he says, "my mind had been full of ob-

jections against the doctrine of God's sovereignty, in choosing whom he would to eternal life, and rejecting whom he pleased; leaving them eternally to perish, and be everlastingly tormented in hell. It used to appear like a horrible doctrine to me. But I remember the time very well, when I seemed to be convinced and fully satisfied, as to this sovereignty of God, and his justice in thus eternally disposing of men, according to his sovereign pleasure. But never could give an account, how, or by what means, I was thus convinced, not in the least imagining at the time, nor a long time after, that there was any extraordinary influence of God's Spirit in it; but only that now I saw further, and my reason apprehended the justice and reasonableness of it. However, my mind rested in it; and it put an end to all those cavils and objections. And there has been a wonderful alteration in my mind, with respect to the doctrine of God's sovereignty, from that day to this; so that I scarce ever have found so much as the rising of an objection against it, in the most absolute sense, in God's showing mercy to whom he will show mercy, and hardening whom he will. God's absolute sovereignty and justice, with respect to salvation and damnation, is what my mind seems to rest assured of, as much as of anything that I see with my eyes; at least it is so at times. But I have often, since that first conviction, had quite another kind of sense of God's sovereignty than I had then. I have often since had not only a conviction, but a delightful conviction. The doctrine has often appeared exceeding pleasant, bright, and sweet. Absolute sovereignty is what I love to ascribe to God. But my first conviction was not so." (*Edwards' Works*, vol. 1, p. 33.)

Verily it is a fearful thing for the God of Jonathan Edwards to fall into the hands of Henry Ward Beecher!

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

ARTICLE IV.

MRS. BROWNING AND CHRISTIAN POETRY.

THERE is no field so rich in poetic thought and inspiration as Christianity. It is true that hitherto the great majority of the world's poets have gathered their fragrant flowers in the shady nooks and picturesque walks of Nature, and have sung their thrilling lays around the salient angles of epic narrative, or

along the hot, beaten road of natural and unsanctified passion. With a few noble exceptions, to whom the Church is deeply indebted, and whose rich, harmonious notes will grow sweeter and more precious as time glides on, poets have drank their inspiration at the shallower streams of sentimental morality and naturalism, if not even at the muddy pools of the sensuous and the sensual. Surely it is not always to be so.

So certainly and rapidly as the promised dawn of millennial day approaches, the time will come when the grand themes and events in Christianity will stir the Muse to her highest and proudest achievements. The end of poetry, it has been said, is to produce intellectual pleasure by exciting emotions either of the elevated or pathetic order. Where, aside from religion, can be found themes so elevated and pathetic? Aristotle defines poetry to be "imitation," in the sense that it finds its models in Nature; or, as another philosopher has said, "poetry doth raise and erect the mind by submitting the shows of things to the desire of the mind."

Religion fathoms the lowest depths and the sublimest heights of Nature; it is the reality of "things," "the shows" of which the rectified soul longs to have exhibited to it. The themes of religion connect us with the infinite God and his eternal plans; with sin and woe, and their glorious remedy. What other contemplations are calculated so to stir the mind with pathetic and elevated emotions?

These themes are yet to take an absorbing and controlling hold of the public heart and mind; to move men as they move the angelic hosts. There will be a day when the exciting intelligence that shall come along the wires, and over the seas, shall not be of stocks and markets, but of the triumphs of the Redeemer's kingdom. There will be seen to be, in Redemption and its kindred truths, such a fitness to man's need, that, when it comes to be grasped, will cause it to stir the souls of the millions as no other themes ever did or ever could. Then will there be a new age of poetry, and poetry of such melting pathos, and of such ennobling, glorifying power, as shall cause men to loath the maudlin verse, and tinsel mimicry of all the Nature-worshipping, or the sensuous and sensual poets.

Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning is a great, Christian poetess.

Her style and range of thought are so scholastic, requiring so much deliberation, thought, and culture in the reading, that, unfortunately, she can never write for the millions. But as to genius she certainly stands in the front rank of female poets; and perhaps her wide and strong grasp, her towering imagination, her deep pathos, her power of exact, condensed language, place her at the head of the list. Mr. Bayne deliberately assigns her "the same place among women as Shakspeare occupies among men." His testimony as to the deeply and pervasively Christian character of her poetry is so much to my purpose that I shall invite him to take the stand, claiming only the privilege of italicizing some of his words.

"Mrs. Browning is in the highest sense, and always, a Christian poetess. She has drunk more deeply into the *spirituality* of the Gospel, and, it may even be, looked with greater earnestness and amazement upon certain of its most sublime facts, than Milton . . . not ethically, not sentimentally, not alone in spirit, far less for artistic purposes, but in the strictness and literalness of actual belief . . . all those central truths of Christianity which have been accepted by the mightiest minds of the era, Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Neander; and once more it has been demonstrated that the bare facts of Christianity transcend in sublimity any counterfeit, and more powerfully stimulate a really great imagination than any other theme whatever. . . . Over all the domain of her poetry, over its central ranges, its quiet gardened valleys, its tinkling rills, falls a radiance of Gospel light. Ever, as her music rises to its noblest cadence, it seems taken up by an angel harp; the highest tone is as the voice of spirits. It would, I cannot doubt, be to their own sincere enjoyment and real profit, if the Christian public pressed boldly into the temple of Mrs. Browning's song. She is a Christian poetess, not in the sense of appreciating, like Carlyle, the loftiness of the Christian type of character, — not in the sense of adopting, like Goethe, a Christian machinery for artistic self-worship, — not even in the sense of preaching, like Wordsworth, an august but abstract morality, — but in the sense of finding, like Cowper, the whole hope of humanity bound up in Christ, and taking all the children of her mind to him, that he may lay his hand on them and bless them."

Her appreciative, and evidently experimental, valuation of the Atonement is delectable. Christ is "the chiefest among ten thousand" to her. In her dedication to her father, she

speaks of his holding, with her, "over all sense of loss and transiency, *one hope by one Name.*"

It is a significant fact, and highly corroborative of the opening sentence of this paper, that Mrs. Browning's greatest poems are the two which are chiefly Christian. Their one aim seems to be the pure and vivid exhibition of the grand, distinguishing truths of evangelical religion. "The Seraphim" is a conversation between angels as they view the crucifixion of Christ.

We shall have space only to make brief extracts from the "*Drama of Exile,*" which presents, in stronger coloring than we have anywhere seen, both the terrible nature of the apostasy, and the grandeur of the recovery of man. It opens in the lurid glare of the waving sword-flame, just outside of Eden, where, in the distance, Adam and Eve are seen flying, silent, all day along the wilderness. Lucifer stalks upon the stage, and, in the most fiendishly triumphant shout, calls upon his infernal legions to exult, and to "taunt the white heavens" with the irreparable woe which he has accomplished.

"Rejoice in the clefts of Gehenna,
My exiled, my host!
Earth has exiles as hopeless as when a
Heaven's empire was lost.
* * * * *
Let them look to the rest of their angels!
Who's safe from a fall?
He saves not. Where's Adam? Can pardon
Requicken that sod?
Unkinged is the King of the Garden,
The image of God."

Then follows a dialogue between Lucifer and Gabriel, in which the opposite characters of the contending parties is drawn with a startling vividness. The Satanic motives and emotions are truly and deeply devilish.

<i>Gabriel.</i>	Do I dream?
Alas, not so! this is the Eden lost	
By Lucifer the serpent! this the sword	
(This sword alive with justice and with fire)	
That smote upon the forehead, Lucifer	
The angel. Wherefore, angel, go—depart—	
Enough is sinned and suffered.	

Lucifer. By no means.
 Here's a brave earth to sin and suffer on.
 It holds fast still — it cracks not under curse ;
 It holds like mine immortal. Presently
 We'll sow it thick enough with graves as green
 Or greener, certes, than its knowledge-tree —
 We'll have the cypress for the tree of life,
 More eminent for shadow : — for the rest
 We'll build it dark with towns, and pyramids,
 And temples, if it please you : — we'll have feasts
 And funerals also, merry-making and wars,
 Till blood and wine shall mix and run along
 Right o'er the edges. And, good Gabriel,
 (Ye like that word in Heaven !) I too have strength —
 Strength to behold Him and not worship Him.
 Strength to fall from Him and not cry on Him,
 Strength to be in the universe and yet
 Neither God nor His servant. The red sign
 Burnt on my forehead, which you taunt me with,
 Is God's sign that it bows not unto God ;
 The potter's mark upon his work, to show
 It rings well to the striker. I and the earth
 Can bear more curse.

Gabriel. O miserable earth,
 O ruined angel !

Lucifer. Well, and if it be !
 I chose this ruin ; I elected it
 Of my will, not of service. What I do,
 I do volitient, not obedient,
 And overtop thy crown with my despair.
 My sorrow crowns me. Get thee back to Heaven,
 And leave me to the earth, which is mine own
 In virtue of her ruin, as I hers
 In virtue of my revolt ! turn thou from both
 That bright, impassive-passive angelhood,
 And spare to read us backward any more
 Of the spent hallelujahs.

After the dialogue, various soft, wailing choruses from the different spirits of Eden fill the air with plaintive melody. Spirits of the Trees, River-Spirits, Bird-Spirits, and Flower-Spirits, in chorus and in varying response, join the lamentation.

River-Spirits. Hark ! the flow of the four rivers —
 Hark, the flow !
 How the silence round you shivers,

While our voices through it go,
Cold and clear."

* * * * *

Flower-Spirits. Fare ye well, farewell!
The Eden scents, no longer sensible,
Expire at Eden's door.
Each footstep of your treading
Treads out some fragrance which ye knew before.
Farewell! the flowers of Eden
Ye shall smell nevermore.

As night comes on, Adam and Eve, having arrived at the outer border of the sword-glare, pause and break the long silence. O what a picture of the dire effects of sin!

Adam. What is this, Eve? thou dropp'st heavily
In a heap earthward, and thy body heaves
Under the golden floodings of thine hair!

Eve. O Adam, Adam! by that name of Eve —
Thine Eve, thy life — which suits me little now,
Seeing that I now confess myself thy death
And thine undoer, as the snake was mine —
I do adjure thee, put me straight away,
Together with my name. Sweet, punish me!
O Love, be just! and, ere we pass beyond
The light cast outward by the fiery sword,
Into the dark which earth must be to us,
Bruise my head with thy foot, — as the curse said
My seed shall the first tempter's! strike with curse,
As God struck in the garden!

* * * * *

Strike, my lord!

I, also, after tempting, writhe on the ground,
And I would feed on ashes from thine hand,
As suits me, O my tempted!

Adam. My beloved,
Mine Eve and life — I have no other name
For thee or for the sun than what ye are,
My utter life and light! If we have fallen,
It is that we have sinned, — we: God is just;
And since his curse doth comprehend us both,
It must be that his balance holds the weights
Of first and last sin on a level. What!
Shall I, who had not virtue to stand straight
Among the hills of Eden, here assume
To mend the justice of the perfect God,

By piling up a curse upon his curse,
Against thee — thee —

Eve. Is it thy voice ?
Or some saluting angel's — calling home
My feet into the garden ?

Adam. O my God !
I, standing here between the glory and dark —
The glory of thy wrath projected forth
From Eden's wall, the dark of our distress
Which settles a step off in that drear world —
Lift up to Thee the hands from whence hath fallen
Only creation's sceptre, — thanking Thee
That rather Thou hast cast me out with *her*
Than left me lorn of her in Paradise,
With angel looks and angel songs around
To show the absence of her eyes and voice,
And make society full desertness
Without her use in comfort !

Eve. Where is loss ?
Am I in Eden ? can another speak
Mine own love's tongue ?

Adam. Because with *her*, I stand
Upright, as far as can be in this fall,
And look away from heaven which doth accuse,
And look away from earth which doth convict,
Into her face, and crown my discrowned heart
Out of her love, and put the thought of her
Around me, for an Eden full of birds,
And lift her body up — thus — to my heart,
And with my lips upon her lips, — thus, thus, —
Do quicken and sublimiate my mortal breath
Which cannot climb against the grave's steep sides,
But overtops this grief !

Lucifer returns, and in the most provoking and insulting manner mocks our first parents with their change, their sufferings and prospects. Chanting angel-voices strive to comfort and sustain them. But the Earth reviles them for being the cause of her briers and thorns, her storms and volcanoes and all her desolating woes. The Zodiac bursts out in terror upon their vision ; the beasts accuse and threaten them ; all Nature frowns upon them, until Christ appears rebuking the Earth-Spirits, unfolds the crucifixion-scene, and with glorious promises and kind words of blessing, cheers and gladdens them.

Christ. I am here !

Adam. This is God ! — Curse us not, God, any more.

Eve. But gazing so — so — with omnific eyes,
Lift my soul upward till it touch thy feet !
Or lift it only, — not to seem too proud, —
To the low height of some good angel's feet,
For such to tread on when he walketh straight
And thy lips praise him.

Christ. Spirits of the earth,
I meet you with rebuke for the reproach
And cruel and unmitigated blame
Ye cast upon your masters. True, they have sinned ;
And true, their sin is reckoned into loss
For you the sinless. Yet your innocence,
Which of you praises ? since God made your acts
Inherent in your lives, and bound your hands
With instincts and imperious sanctities
From self-defacement ? Which of you disdains
These sinners who in falling proved their height
Above you by their liberty to fall ?
And which of you complains of loss by them,
For whose delight and use ye have your life
And honor in creation ? Ponder it !
This regent and sublime Humanity,
Though fallen, exceeds you ! this shall film your sun,
Shall hunt your lightning to its lair of cloud,
Turn back your rivers, footpath all your seas,
Lay flat your forests, master with a look
Your lion at his fasting, and fetch down
Your eagle flying. Nay, without this law
Of mandom, ye would perish, — beast by beast
Devouring.

* * * * *

Eve. Speak on still, *Christ.* Albeit thou bless me not
In set words, I am blessed in harkening thee ; —
Speak, *Christ.*

Christ. Speak, *Adam.* Bless the woman, man ; —
It is thine office.

Adam. Mother of the world,
Take heart before this Presence.

Soon *Christ* is gradually transfigured into humanity and suffering.

Eve. O Saviour *Christ,*
Thou standest mute in glory, like the sun.

Adam. We worship in Thy silence, Saviour *Christ.*

Eve. Thy brows grow grander with a forecast woe, —
Diviner with the possible of death!

We worship in thy sorrow, Saviour Christ.

Adam. How do thy clear, still eyes transpierce our souls,
As gazing *through* them toward the Father-throne
In a pathological, full Deity,
Serenely as the stars gaze through the air,
Straight on each other.

Eve. O pathetic Christ,
Thou standest mute in glory, like the moon.

Christ. Eternity stands always fronting God;
A stern colossal image, with blind eyes
And grand dim lips that murmur evermore
God, God, God!

* * * * *

Howbeit in the noon of time
Eternity shall wax as dumb as Death,
While a new voice beneath the spheres shall cry,
“God! why hast thou forsaken me, my God?”
And not a voice in Heaven shall answer it.

* * * * *

Christ. Then, at last,
I, wrapping round me your humanity,
Which, being sustained, shall neither break nor burn
Beneath the fire of Godhead, will tread earth
And ransom you and it, and set strong peace
Betwixt you and its creatures. With my pangs
I will confront your sins; and since those sins
Have sunken to all Nature's heart from yours,
The tears of my clean soul shall follow them
And set a holy passion to work clear
Absolute consecration. In my brow
Of kingly whiteness shall be crowned anew
Your discrowned human nature. Look on me!
As I shall be uplifted on a cross
In darkness of eclipse and anguish dread,
So shall I lift up in my pierced hands,
Not into dark, but light — not unto death,
But life — beyond the reach of guilt and grief,
The whole Creation. Henceforth in my name
Take courage, O thou woman — man, take hope!
Your grave shall be as smooth as Eden's sward,
Beneath the steps of your prospective thoughts,
And, one step past it, a new Eden-gate
Shall open on a hinge of harmony
And let you through to mercy. Ye shall fall
No more, within that Eden, nor pass out
Any more from it. In which hope, move on,

First sinners and first mourners. Live and love, —
Doing both nobly, because lowly.
Live and work, strongly, because patiently.
And, for the deed of death, trust it to God
That it be well done, unrepented of,
And not to loss. And thence, with constant prayers
Fasten your souls so high, that constantly
The smile of your heroic cheer may float
Above all floods of earthly agonies,
Purification being the joy of pain.

The victory which the Redeemer achieves over “the wild horse of Death” is set in bolder conceptions and language than were ever before uttered. While the stricken and comforted pair advance, hand in hand, into the wilderness, a chorus of invisible angels responsive sing.

Second Semichorus.

Yet a Tamer shall be found !
One more bright than seraph crowned,
And more strong than cherub bold,
Elder, too, than angel old,
By his gray eternities.
He shall master and surprise
The steed of Death,
For He is strong, and He is fain.
He shall quell him with a breath,
And shall lead him where he will,
With a whisper in the ear,
Full of fear —
And a hand upon the mane,
Grand and still.

First Semichorus.

Through the flats of Hades where the souls assemble
He will guide the Death-steed calm between their ranks
While, like beaten dogs, they a little moan and tremble
To see the darkness curdle from the horse's glittering flanks.
Through the flats of Hades where the dreary shade is,
Up the steep of Heaven, will the Tamer guide the steed —
Up the spheric circles — circle above circle,
We who count the ages, shall count the tolling tread —
Every hoof-fall striking a blinder, blanker sparkle
From the stony orbs, which shall show as they were dead.

Second Semichorus.

All the way the Death-steed with tolling hoofs shall travel,

Ashen-gray the planets shall be motionless as stones,
Loosely shall the systems eject their parts coeval —
Stagnant in the spaces, shall float the pallid moons.
Suns that touch their apogees, reeling from their level,
Shall run back on their axles, in wild, low, broken tunes.

Chorus.

Up against the arches of the crystal ceiling,
From the horse's nostrils shall steam the blurring breath.
Up between the angels pale with silent feeling,
Will the Tamer, calmly, lead the horse of Death.

Semichorus.

Cleaving all that silence, cleaving all that glory,
Will the Tamer lead him straightway to the Throne;
"Look out, O Jehovah, to this I bring before Thee
With a hand nail-pierced — I, who am thy Son."
Then the eye Divinest, from the deepest, flaming,
On the mystic courser, shall look out in fire.
Blind the beast shall stagger where it overcame him,
Meek as lamb at pasture — bloodless in desire.
Down the beast shall shiver — slain amid the taming, —
And, by Life essential, the phantasm Death expire.

In these extracts two unfortunate expressions occur, which are calculated to misrepresent the authoress.

"Then the eye Divinest" can only be intended to represent the lower place which our Saviour assumed as necessary to his mission as a suffering servant. For in a previous extract the Supreme Divinity of Christ is unequivocally asserted. Adam says of Him, "This is God!" And Eve, "not to seem too proud," would have her soul lifted up to the height of some good angel's feet.

So also in the passage, —

"So shall I lift up in my pierced hands
The whole Creation."

In consistency with her poetic aim, she would doubtless be understood as meaning what the Saviour himself did in saying, "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me." The door shall be opened to the whole creation, and perhaps in the end it shall be seen that the lost are so few in comparison with the saved as to form the exceptions to the general rule.

ARTICLE V.

FEAR AS A CHRISTIAN MOTIVE.

-- "for a great fear, when it is ill-managed, is the parent of superstition; but a discreet and well-guided fear produces religion."

Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living.

WE often hear it said, "If I ever become a christian, I shall not be frightened into it." It is with us the independence, the contempt of consequences which has become an American characteristic; the "who's afraid?" — which might very well stand for our national motto. Of course, this trait is not peculiar to our people, though common to us in unusually exaggerated development; still less, we need hardly add, is it the token (but quite the reverse) of a true manliness, wherever it is found.

This tendency has further been fostered by a one-sided philosophy and a maudlin philanthropy, the prime law and mission of which would seem to be to try the power of rose-water as a universal disinfectant; that is, to straighten all crooked things and to rectify all wrong things by what we must be suffered to call a system of general *coaxing*. We greatly regret that the recent "Plummer" professor at Harvard has lent his name to something very like this theory. He introduces with approbation, in a recent occasional sermon, the story of the crazy woman at Cincinnati, who rushed into the cars, with a bowl of water in one hand and a torch in the other, saying that she wanted with these to drown out hell and burn up heaven, that people might do right *because they ought to*, without reference to consequences. And this the reverend rector would have us believe is the next great improvement in pulpit-practice. We would be respectful, but honestly we conceive the comment to be as bereft of sense as the text. We prefer not to go to crazy people for our theology. The good old bishop who gives us a motto was wiser than the late novice. While then, on the one hand, all appeal to the influence of fear in morals and religion is repulsed as degrading our free and self-governing manli-

ness which acknowledges "no man master," and no God either, too often; on the other hand we are gravely told that this motive is at war, as well, with correct ethical principles and the working of christian benevolence. We purpose to examine the soundness of these assumptions.

We begin by observing, that the basis of fear, in our experience, is a constitutional susceptibility. We were so made as to feel, under certain conditions, this emotion. It is as original with us as is the power to love, to trust, to enjoy. For the most part it acts involuntarily, as when you spring to avoid a falling body, or start back from a serpent. Its object is, to guard from danger; then it must often act too quickly for deliberation or thought. But, it also results from processes of calm reflection revealing to the mind aspects of life which involve peril, and exciting the feeling of aversion and avoidance. Thus, you would not be likely to go into a plague or fever district; nor to embark on a voyage in a leaky ship; nor to leap from a rail-car in full motion. Why not? Simply because you would be afraid of the effects. That would be the reason, and you would not be ashamed to own it. You recognize and confess this susceptibility as a most beneficent protective from injury.

But is it probable that God would invent a guard like this against evil to operate only in some inferior and temporary concerns, but with no design of its intervention in the principal interests of humanity? That is, would he put within us a power of self-defence from a broken bone, a contagion of disease, an unsafe confidence in some enemy, while no alarum shall spring its rattle to warn us of the risks and ruins of our immortal hopes? If a salutary apprehension may do us good service in the minor affairs of every-day life, why not in our vastly superior relations to God and moral obligation? It is not natural to believe that any such limitation of this sense of fear from a religious application was designed. We argue from the less to the greater, that God would not do more, in setting up our complex mechanism, for the bodily than for the spiritual safety of his offspring; that, therefore, fear as a motive was given us as well for the one set of wants as for the other; that it has as legitimate a field of action in determining questions of christian con-

duct as in cautioning us against fire or deep water. The philosophy of the subject is manifestly on our side. We take another step:—

There is nothing unbecoming our manhood in yielding to this influence on any real occasion of alarm. We are not to lose our self-possession in the presence of peril: that is a panic fear which defeats its own object, as it wholly unfits one to meet or avoid the threatening evil. But to see, to realize, to dread, to shun any danger, which it is not a clear duty to encounter, is entirely in keeping with our highest endowments of mind and heart. Here, a thoughtful consideration of things comes into play, to help out our mere instinctive impulses of caution. This reflective faculty is ours peculiarly. The lower animals have the instinct of fear; so have we. But, not like us, they have no forecast to discern, to measure, to elude impending troubles. As we have this ability in many directions, it is not beneath us to use it. It was given us for use. We keep it in constant service for all manner of worldly purposes, never dreaming that this is an unmanly painstaking. We set a watch against the prowling burglar calculating narrowly his chances of escape from our carefully prepared means of his detection and arrest, and never think it any disgrace to own that fear prompts our vigilance. Courage is not a foolhardy recklessness of consequences in any matter. It is closely and naturally allied to cautionary tendencies and dispositions.

“Fear to do base, unworthy things, is valor.”

The bravest man feels that he is entitled to whatsoever helps he can thus throw between himself and harm.

It is not ingenuous nature, then, but an atheistic pride, which suggests that fear is a questionable motive to be resorted to in the province of religious duty. The idea has nothing analogous to it elsewhere in human life. It is a wrong sentiment, the effect of which is not to ennoble our intellectual or moral state, but to debase, to brutify us, by a hardening, deadening process; turning us not into heroes but desperadoes, by destroying our sensibilities, and by the disuse of an original and important power which has a right to be exercised wherever in the relations and facts of our being there is anything for it to do.

Is there any christian work, then, for this functionary? This is our next question; and we are now ready to entertain it.

We affirm that there are just occasions of alarm involved in our spiritual circumstances as conditioned by transgression. Had obedience continued, as it began, to control the human will, that perfect love to duty would have excluded all fear which is allied to terror. So, as grace restores us to purity, this emotion finds less and less place within us, until in a perfectly sanctified heart it will not have a conscious existence; as in heaven it must be an entire stranger. In a word, it does not belong to a right, but to a wrong and rebellious posture of humanity. As is the wrongness, therefore, of a man religiously, so is the occasion of fear with respect to his prospects under the righteous government of God.

It springs legitimately from facts like these; that the first obligation of every soul, in virtue of its creation in God's image, is to be like God in spirit and character; that, contrariwise, all flesh does actually and by preference corrupt its way upon the earth. It glances from the infinite pureness of God to the fathomless vileness of man, and gathers paleness at the terrible contrast. Here begins the revelation of God and of our own consciousness. Here we are lost in sin and condemnation. We are not lost unless we are condemned. We are not condemned unless we are sinful. But this is Heaven's word against us — that by nature we are children of disobedience and wrath. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God;" cause and effect interacting continually to deepen the crime, to multiply the default; men falling short, more and more of the Divine glory by added sins; and sinning more and more, by thus failing to glorify eternal, faultless Excellence. This is the case; that, bound by every bond to do everything for and in God, we naturally do nothing thus, but always reversely, for self and the world; and every such choice, purpose, act, is sin, of which God has said: — "The soul that sinneth it shall die." And man is "dead in trespasses and sins" until Christ gives him life. This is the objective basis of Christ's work. He saves the lost. His mission attests, demonstrates the utter ruin of our race. He entered our world as into a vast hospital of

the death-smitten, as into the prison-cells of sentenced malefactors. He came to nothing short of a scene of universal moral destruction. The prophet's valley of the slain is history here. He stood as on the shore of a wild ocean, with the whole destiny of mankind crowded on board one struggling, sinking wreck in the offing, and he launched the only life-boat which could reach the foundering ship to bring off the drowning company. And the ship has not gone down yet, and the life-boat has been rowing around her from the first, never going ashore to rest her oarsmen, nor missing the smallest chance to pick up another and another of the perishing, under her pilot's steady hand and loving eye. Here only does our Lord's human life find its explanation, does his death find its vindication. This is the key which unlocks "the mystery of God manifest in the flesh," that "when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."

Were this, however, all the truth upon this subject, it might go rather to allay apprehension than to excite it. But additional considerations come in to complete the facts involved. Redemption shows us how real and total is human ruin which could demand such a measure of recovery. Now, if by that act or event man's salvation is positively secured to him without further effort, he has nothing to concern himself about. His passage is taken and his ticket is paid for; and like Jonah he may go to sleep for the voyage "in the sides of the ship." *This is not all.* In a vital sense, that passage is to be worked all the way into port. Grace must be penitently accepted. The teaching is unequivocal. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish,"—*likewise*—as surely as they whom the tower of Siloam crushed. Texts need not be multiplied. The doctrine of mercy is this, that God intends our conversion and sanctification by our own earnest coöperating with him to this result; that to this we must seek deliverance from past guilt and safeguard from future, at Christ's hand; that, this not done, the sin of our lives presses upon us; our sentence of execution hangs over us; we are still absolutely and hopelessly undone; we are ever increasing our crime by refusing the release offered; we are thus despising God in his compassions, and resisting his Holy Spirit, and treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, and

preparing ourselves for a terrible judgment and an eternity of despair; when, in all our uncleansed vileness and unsoftened hardness of heart, we shall fall before the onward tread of the justice of that God who with all his loving-kindness is nevertheless "a consuming fire."

These are alarming truths in man's condition. Language can teach nothing more positively than the Bible states them. And what is most fearful of all is their dire necessity; and this not a necessity of vindictive severity, — no passionate claim of a "jealous God," as our theosophists interpret that Hebrew phrase into a moody, capricious tyrant, — but an absolute demand of purest benevolence. *God is Love*; and that perfect quality of his nature and life necessitates his holy law, with all its outgrowths of strict government, of pains and penalties to the lawless even to the "bitter end" of everlasting punishment in perdition. "God is Love," — not to wrong but to right, not to sin but to holiness, not to anarchy but to order, not to rebels but to friends; to all he is Pity and Compassion; to a part only is he Love. He is too good to let himself be conquered by revolt, to suffer sinning to prosper. Love forbids it.* Calvary responds to Sinai an answering No! Justice which bares the sword over the culprit's head is but a form or modification of that very benevolence which guarantees unwasting honors to the unfallen; which reinstates the penitent in favor through Christ's accepted mediation. Jesus and Jehovah are at one at this point. The Almighty "not only hates sin, but he punishes it. He has no more moral right or power to detach suffering from sin than he has to detach peace and joy from holiness. The connection between them is fixed, inseparable, and can no more change than the Divine nature can change. Where there is sin there must be suffering; and suffering flow-

* It is noticeable how deeply this principle is fixed even in the natural and the pagan mind. Thus *Seneca*: — "*Vitia transmittit ad posteros, qui presentibus culpis ignoscit.*" "*Amici vitia si feras, facis tua.*" "*Bonus nocet qui malis parcit.*" The sentiment is the same: — he punishes those who shall come after, who spares existing wrong: — if we overlook the misdeeds of a friend, we make these our own: — he hurts the good who absolves the bad. This is christian truth. And so *Augustine* says: — It is better to love with severity, than to delude with courtesy. "*Melius est cum severitate diligere, quam cum lenitate decipere.*" Our proverb "cruel kindness," embodies the same idea, which in God has its most thorough reprehension, both by precept and example.

ing from sin, and in consequence of sin, is something more than suffering; it is punishment." * The sinner consequently has nothing to hope for from God's clemency, if still persisting to have his own way. For the good will which would save him if penitent and believing, must relentlessly punish him if he will not come within the circle of holy loyalty. The prodigal staying in his far country must starve. The tenant barring himself out-of-doors must shiver and freeze in the cold night-air, burn the lights never so cheerily within.

Our argument would not be complete if it omitted to add that God has himself made great use of fear as a christian motive. The Scriptures have as many threatenings in them as promises, — a *Nay* for every *Yea*. Ebal and Gerizim still confront each other with only as narrow a valley between as ever. If Jesus says — "he that believeth shall be saved," what does he say except the reverse, even if he had not given utterance to that terrible reverse in words, — "and he that believeth not shall be damned!" The first clause of the sentence virtually gives its counterpart. But he did not pause there; he did actually pronounce the whole sentence; and He the Judge of men has never unsaid it. Now, not to go into a long citation of similar proofs, which the intelligent reader very well knows are scattered all through the inspired pages, notice this — that the express purpose of the convicting Spirit among men is to "convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." He takes the startling facts of human sin, of Divine righteousness, of coming judgment, and does with them — what? Just what the health-officer does with the statistics of small-pox or fever; he uses them to wake up men to danger; rings a fire-bell to bring from their beds the falsely and fatally secure, when the house is burning around them. He cries in heavy ears — "flee from the wrath to come!" Does God then wish to frighten us? Yes, most undoubtedly; as you would call to a child venturing out on thin ice, in the most searching tones, not to deprive him of the power of escape, but to stimulate every faculty to make that escape. God evidently has distinctly aimed to arouse men's fears. So did his Apostles. "Knowing

* Upland's "Mad. Guyon's Memoirs"; II. 54.

therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." And what is this "terror of the Lord"? The previous verse contains at least a part of it:—"For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." There was to Paul's not timid mind something appalling in this vision, something which men should fear, and fearing should avoid. We wonder not at it when he has elsewhere written, and probably believed as he wrote—"the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe—in that day."

Apostolical christianity surely did not disguise the alarming aspects of God's moral government. Sent by his master to speak with a proud Roman ruler on these themes, Paul reasoned with him of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment," until Felix trembled. So God employed this method of rebuke and of repentance under the prophets. Their ministry was largely that of terror. Nor did Christ spare the proclamations of woe upon woe to the sinners of his day. He told them that, guiltier of more than a Sodom's sin, they should sink to a deeper than a Sodom's hell. Why did he tell those refined and fashionable and fastidious people of Jerusalem and Capernaum this? Certainly to excite a "discreet fear" which might "produce religion."

If we look into christian experience we shall find that this element of fear has in some form been very generally present in the earlier stages at least of the renewing work; and that not among the ruder, less intelligent minds alone, but among the cultured, the farthest removed from a superstitious credulity. There is no weakness in looking seriously at a portentous fact, and acting accordingly. There is no superstition in standing in awe of Almighty displeasure. It is a sheer madness which leaps down a Niagara. So sensible persons judge. And if any man feels his spirit quailing within him as he thinks

of death and eternity, of God's controversy with his ungodly living, and of the risks of his abandonment to hopeless hardness of heart, he need not therefore blush before any comrade nor apologize to any questioner. It is by such suggestions that the first steps are often induced out of worldliness, frivolity, impiety, towards repentance. The thought that this is the sinner's *last call*, that if he refuses this, no heavenly word will ever more break again on his heart, — that fearful thought has risen up in the soul like a cloud of midnight-darkness, appalling as the shutting in of the long night of endless despair; and the spirit, thus aroused by this "terror of the Lord," has not dared to run the hazard of this tremendous peradventure. Thus being fixed in a determination to defer the business of religion no longer, the mind has yielded itself to other and more elevated considerations through which God's spirit carries onward the new creating work.

Thus far the argument, which both logically and theologically we regard as irrefutable. As it is grounded not in the conditions of special stages of barbarism, or semi-civilization, or anything of this factitious or temporary kind, but in elementary spiritual truths, it is an argument as well for the nineteenth century as for the ninth or first. It has a bearing or two of present urgency, inside the Church, which must hold us a page or two longer before closing this paper.

The prevalent reluctance of many good people to an outspoken deliverance of the alarming doctrines of our faith, is alike philosophically and religiously wrong. Are they Gospel facts? Then they should be announced. Is "God angry with the wicked every day?" Then it should be known; and if men forget it, then it should be reiterated.

It has already been intimated that this susceptibility of fear is not of so lofty a nature as are others of our endowments. Nor do we believe that men ever become christians under its simple prompting. "Fear does not produce virtue; the fact that a man restrains himself from sin to avoid the punishment of hell is no proof that he is converted: — but it goes out into the highways of a blighted and delirious world, and there, like a terrible prophet of the wilderness who foretells the coming of the mild Redeemer, startles and arouses men. Its office is prelim-

inary, external, awakening; it is the beginning of wisdom." * Then, let the Elijah, the John, though clothed in the rough garb of the desert, fulfil his pioneer ministry, that so the Christ may come in power and grace to the humble, the consciously needy and perishing. You say, that men cannot be driven into religion. True; nor can they be flattered or coaxed into it. But this is the case:—certain aspects of God's law, government, purposes, bear directly and alarmingly on human sinfulness, and are suited to the end of conversion to piety, if so blessed by the Holy Spirit. If presented, conversion *may* not follow. If withheld, conversion *will* not, in most instances, be attained. That is, men are not likely to turn unto God with their whole hearts, unless they see very distinctly that there is something exceedingly undesirable and appalling from which to turn. Lot fled in haste to the mountain when he saw Sodom all in a blaze behind him, and the plain beneath him heaving with volcanic throes.

Ministers, moreover, are not to be called bigoted, severe, behind the just requirements of the age, who exhibit the sterner shadows of God administration. As well call the surgeon cruel who hurts you in probing a deep wound or in setting a broken bone. The pain he inflicts does not argue the want of a tender spirit. His design is beneficent, and you will thank him when the cure is completed. The teacher of religion is sacredly bound to teach the whole of it, — its hard as well as its easy lessons. He too is a spiritual physician, and he must practise like his Divine Master. Nor is it his fault if there is no pain-destroying ether which he can administer, so as that the surgery shall proceed unconsciously to the patient, and he find himself a sound man without knowing how it happened. On the contrary, the very nature of our work requires that every conscious power of the soul be awake to coöperate in this act of a restoration unto God. And whatever can aid in this awakening of the soul to its salvation is demanded to be employed, by the purest good-will, the divinest compassion. They are the cruel men in the pulpit who never send a thrill of alarm through the pews; who prophesy smooth things, who hush God's thunders in the lullabies of Arcadian measures.

* Bayne's "Christian Life," p. 37.

If an orthodox day of judgment be necessary to keep Down-Eastern lumbermen from plundering each other's logs, (and so, it is said, even Boston liberalism has decided,) who shall show that it and its correlatives are not just as much needed to check our city-merchants from defrauding one another, and in bringing them to contrition and restitution for such sins?

We do not mean that topics of this character are to be continually exhibited in the instructions of the sanctuary. They are to be discreetly used in due season and proportion. They are adapted rather to the condition of the careless or the reckless transgressor, to those who "are at ease in Zion," than to the mind already awake to religious inquiry, or to the believer advancing upon the upward road. To these, love has other more befitting accents and appeals. But how shall the masses of ungodly men and women be made to feel the beauty of holiness, the attractiveness of Christ, the spiritual excellence of God? — how be arrested to turn an eye toward heaven, except by some lightning-flash, some thunder-peal from those azure depths of mingled light and gloom, splendor and terror? God, who made the mind, understands its wants, its workings. And men who preach his truth will not find a better guide to follow than his own method of dealing with those whom He would have to fear his displeasure that they may be brought to taste his grace. That method is "goodness and severity." It is simple, sensible, rational, biblical. "Of some have compassion, making a difference: and others save with fear, [*ἐν φόβῳ*, with anxious zeal and with solemn threatenings,] pulling them out of the fire;" feeling ourselves and making them feel that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

ARTICLE VI.

IT WAS ALWAYS SO.

THE good old times! who has not heard of them? — the age when patriotism was unselfish and manners uncorrupt, when

cities were simple in their tastes and frugal in their habits, and the country was tilled by men who feared God and kept his commandments. The good old times! when youth treated age with respect, when doctrine was sound, and good men walked with God heavenward, instead of sailing with the adversary in gilded barges down the stream.

The very mention of such times is like a breath of mountain-air to the invalid cooped up in the stifling lanes of the city. It is like the sight of his early home, bringing glad memories of childhood to the heart now old and sad and solitary.

It is not strange, then, that we find this admiration of the past in all ages. Even the heathen, amid corruption round about him, paints the picture of a golden age, and heathen poesy adorns it with all that is lovely and of good report.

The old man, long familiar with the hollowness of earthly good, turns regretfully to the time when all seemed real, and no troublesome suspicion of what might be beneath, marred the enjoyment of the gilded surface glittering in the sun. Even the Christian grappling with defiant sin, and watching unto prayer against the treacherous dealing of wily foes, sighs for the simplicity of primitive piety, when good men did not need to be armed with the whole armor of God, and stand forever on their guard.

So the past is commended as the age of piety and peace, while the present is worse than all that has gone before, and prepares for greater evil yet to come. This is a view natural to many minds. But all such comparisons are unprofitable, because it is difficult to compare the two correctly.

We cannot form an accurate estimate of the present. We see only a part of it; the rest we judge by hearsay; and while our information is deficient, our conclusions are still wider of the truth. That which we see assumes undue prominence. It becomes the standard whereby we judge the much larger part that is unseen. Our native land seems large, and distant countries small, though in fact much larger. There are few among us who are not surprised to find the empire of Brazil larger than the whole United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the little country of Switzerland nearly twice as large as Massachusetts, which last is scarcely larger than the

diminutive Duchy of Würtemberg. Now this onesidedness, so palpable in our geography, exists as really in other things. The men with whom we come in contact give character to our ideas of the rest of the community. Then, besides all this, many things are not what they seem to be. There is an apparent and a real world. The affliction, which we class among evils, may be such a manifestation of the love of God as ought to be classed among the highest blessings. The event that seemed to involve the ruin of the nation may prove to have been its salvation. So also to most men there is an outer and an inner character. We may count him a co-worker with Christ, who is really serving Satan; we may deem a flaming professor a veritable saint, when he is rotten at the core. On the other hand, we may assign one of God's hidden ones a place among the ungodly, whereas he is being made meet for an inheritance among the saints in light. Even inspiration does not always correct this false judgment. It was a Prophet of the Lord who complained that he was left alone, while seven thousand men had not bowed the knee to Baal. And it was an Apostle who wrote, "By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, *as I suppose*, I have written briefly."

If our judgment of the present is liable to such mistakes, how much more our judgment of the past, where so much more concurs to mislead us. Just as we insensibly make our abode the centre of the world, so do we make our own age the centre of history, and measure things not by an absolute standard, but in their relation to our stand-point.

Then there is much that we can see in our contemporaries that is not to be seen in the men of a past age. When we look on a living Christian we see a strange mixture of good and evil. The actings of grace and depravity succeed each other in such strange combinations that we are bewildered, — we seem to look at the changes of a kaleidoscope rather than at a finished painting. But in the biographies of the sainted dead, grace is brought into the foreground, and depravity is thrown into the shade; then the good things scattered through long years of actual life are crowded into a few pages of the memoir; and as the eye glances over them we forget the long intervals that separated the actual occurrences, or the protracted process that produced the excellencies we admire.

Again, when we look at a good man, living out his goodness, our eye rests at the same moment on many who are anything but good. As the man writing in a crowd finds many strange words disturbing the unity of his thoughts, so we, while listening to the good words of living men, are compelled at the same time to overhear many bad words from every side. But it is not so when we look into the past. There we can make a selection, we can shut out the ungodly and admit only the spiritually minded to our field of view. The Christian never opens the ribald poetry of the past, its infidel writings, its immoral works of fiction. In his mind a past age is associated exclusively with the writings of its spiritually minded men. He judges the 17th and 18th centuries, not by the pages of Hobbes or Hume, Smollet or Fielding, Dryden, or his compeers equally indelicate, but less brilliant; but by the heavenly thoughts of Robert Leighton, or Richard Baxter, John Owen, or George Herbert; and in the delighted perusal of their pages he forgets that they were surrounded by just such a world as rages round us to-day. The writer of "The Saint's Rest" did not give himself to those heavenly contemplations soothed by surrounding stillness, and borne along by influences on all sides that drew him up to heaven; but he was driven to it by the direness of his distress, by pain and persecution, under such monarchs as Charles the Second, and his Popish successor, and at the bar of such a judge as the infamous George Jeffries.

That good man calls himself, on the title-page of one of his works, "An earnest desirer of the love, peace, and unity of true Christians, for endeavoring which he expecteth with resolved patience still to undergo the censures, slanders and cruelties of ignorance, pride, and malice, from all that are possessed by the wisdom and zeal which are from beneath."

It is one of the highest achievements of genius to delineate the past as it actually was. We have records enough of the great occurrences that tower up conspicuous along the line of events; but the ordinary things of every-day life, out of which rose up those events, *these* we have not; and, to fill the vacancy, men insert ideas of their own which are anything but true. Actual life is rugged, uneven, involved and full of incongruities. It presents unpleasant aspects. It abounds in discomforts. The snow at a distance is beautiful in its rounded outline of spotless

white ; but near by, it chills you. It is fatiguing to wade through it. It involves suffering and exposure. There is something exceedingly bright and glorious in a Syrian sun. Read it described on the glowing page, and you long to behold it. But then it is intensely hot. It dries up the streams. It parches you with thirst, so that while you look you are distressed, and your tongue cleaves to the roof of your mouth. Now, in looking at the past, we reconstruct the landscape to our own liking. The unpleasant features that would not disappear in the original, we motion out of sight in our ideal picture. The hard things that refused to bend at our bidding in the one case, are perfectly obedient in the other. They range themselves here or there, this way or that, as best suits our fancy. They hide this aspect, and reveal that, at our option. Everything is plastic as the potter's clay. But is it wise to create an ideal unlike to all that has been under the sun, and, calling that the past, straightway contrast it unfavorably with the present ?

This comparison of the past with the present is unwise because human nature is very much the same in all ages. The pendulum swings now this way and now that, but it is ever the same disk vibrating between the same extremes. The particular position may vary, but the movement is uniform, and can be calculated. The particular developments of depravity may vary, but the root is the same. The particular form of wickedness may depend on the time and place of its manifestation, but it must exist in some shape, while things are as they are. You may anticipate an era of dreadful crime as the result of causes now at work in society, but will it be more dreadful than antediluvian violence ? Here wickedness is more gross, there it is disguised ; now it speaks plainly, and again in daintier phrase ; but ever it is the same world whose friendship is enmity with God.

The same is true when this enmity assumes the form of opposition to the truth as it is in Jesus. It attacks, now this doctrine and now that. Here it is the outspoken infidelity of Voltaire ; there it is the covert attack of a self-styled Christian teacher. Sometimes it assumes the guise of a scripture commentary, professing to rid the truth of scholastic accretions and render it more popular. Sometimes it is an avowed onset on fundamental truths. These Christians are under the ban of

the empire, those under the ban of public opinion. To-day they are reviled, yesterday they were persecuted, and to-morrow they are treated with silent scorn. But whether smiting, sneering, or smiling, it is ever the same hatred of the truth of God.

The truth is, the battle rages along the whole line of the ages. The uniform may wear out and be changed, but the leaders are ever the same. God is always on the one side and Satan on the other. The Word of God is the watchword of these, and away with it, is the rallying cry of those. If in any age there seems to be an end to the conflict, it is either because the champions of the truth are remiss in duty, or because secret sapping promises better than open attack. The time of peace is not yet. Set it down as one of the fixed facts that permanent quiet is not to be looked for till the last remnant of false doctrine has perished from the earth. For God makes no compromises, and will not suffer any to be made, till the last foe is put under Christ's footstool. Nor will he be satisfied with any mere refraining from attack, or acceptance of statements resembling the truth, while the truth itself is not relished in the heart.

The past and present are alike to an extent never dreamed of by superficial observers. In both, evil practices are arrayed against righteousness, and righteousness against evil practices. In both there is the semblance of peace between right and wrong, which is only a semblance; and in both the opposition between flames out, spite of all attempts to smother it. In all ages the same downward tendencies ever war against piety, and the influence of the world is ever felt on the side of evil; so that, whether it be coarse or refined, boorish or polite, he who would serve God must renounce the world. Always is the same inward conflict with corruption, and the same external contest with the foe. The position of the armies changes with the ages. Their tactics vary with circumstances. The form of their weapons is different. But the conflict is one. Now it is, Transgress, or die; again, Do so, or be penniless; and yet again, Do so, or be marked as one by yourself apart from others. But ever it is the same command; — Disobey God, or suffer the utmost evil his enemies can inflict.

If the motives of the man who stands up for Christian truth are maligned to-day, so was it in the days of Baxter and Calvin, of Paul and of our Saviour. If men to-day bring in privily damnable heresies, it is nothing new under the sun. They did the same in the days of Reformers and Apostles. Jeremiah had to fight with false prophets all his life long.

If in our warfare for truth and right, even good men stand aloof, or fail us in our hour of need, could Luther tell of no such hours of darkness? or could Paul be unable to sympathize with our distress?

Elijah also had to flee from the court of the king to the less hostile desert.

If to-day some find their usefulness hindered by false brethren in the Church, does their experience in that line come up to the measure of Apostolic suffering from the same cause?

Whenever men magnify the past at the expense of the present, there is danger lest they feel that it would have been greatly for their advantage to have lived in some previous age, and that they suffer great injury from that arrangement of Providence that makes them live to-day rather than centuries ago. A man, ere he is aware of it, may thus blame God for casting his lot in such evil times. It is unnecessary to show how unfounded are such complaints, or how injurious in their effects on the complainer. But the indulgence of such thoughts leads directly to these results; and though for a time a man may not be conscious of them, yet they may secretly gather such strength that, when brought to his notice, he may justify rather than abhor them.

Such views also lead to discouragement and despair. For if under the government of the all-wise and omnipotent God, the world is ever growing worse than before, and even the Church degenerating from previous attainment instead of pressing toward the mark for the prize of its high calling, what hope is there of the glorious future so long foretold? And if there is so little prospect of that future which God holds out to us in his Word, can he be faithful in other things more than in this? Can I trust those exceeding great and precious promises to the individual if those to the whole Church fail so palpably? What, then, is the influence of such views on all effort for good to men?

If the Church grows worse from age to age, if true piety is ever losing ground, of what use is it to labor for the conversion of the world? Does not that glorious object recede into the distant future instead of drawing nearer? And what a view of Christ does all this involve? He bids us pray, "Thy kingdom come," and then, "Thy will be done on earth as it is done in Heaven," — plainly encouraging us to hope that it shall be so; and yet, according to the views before us, instead of bringing about that result, he is moving everything back in the opposite direction. Who can think so and have any heart to toil or pray for the promised millennium? But, worse than all, what sort of a Redeemer must he be who encourages such hopes only to disappoint them?

Views that involve such consequences cannot be true. The former days were not better than these. If this is an evil and adulterous generation, we have reliable testimony that it is not the first of that sort. If some who hear the Gospel to-day are a generation of vipers, they too had predecessors long ago. If we find it difficult to meet the obloquy incurred by standing up for the faith once delivered to the saints, would it have been easier to do the same thing under Nero? or under the surveillance of "the Holy Office," or with Puritans and Covenanters in the days of the Stuarts?

What, then, do those accomplish for Christ who deal out dolorous descriptions of Christian degeneracy and make but the one impression: "Things were never so bad before?" Is there any merit in affirming what is not true? Or is there any incentive to effort in believing such teaching? Better far if, taking things as they are, we gird up our loins and take unto ourselves the whole armor of God, that we may be able to stand in the evil day. Thus armed, let us stand forth good soldiers of a good leader in a good cause. Evils there are, but when did they not exist? Men may tell us they abound, but when were they less abundant? Work is to be done, and hard work; but has there been a time since man fell in Eden when it was not required? Sufferings await the faithful servant. But when or where did God leave his people without some test to distinguish the true servant of Christ from the seeker of his own ease? Is there no secret shrinking from "hardness" under this whining about the degeneracy of our age?

It has been said of earthly troubles,

"If you gently touch a nettle, it will sting you for your pains;
Grasp it like a man of mettle, and it soft as silk remains."

And the same is true in spiritual things. They whose chief end is to consult their own happiness, will always miss it. Past, Present, and Future will combine to distress them. But the heart armed with the purpose to follow Christ even in suffering — if needs be — as he suffered, will find Omnipotence bear it along its appointed course.

But it will be said, "When we find even good men arrayed against us, what are we to think?" Why, that it always has been so. Had Abraham consulted some good man of his day, whether he should go to Mount Moriah, would his adviser have told him go? When Peter told his Master, resolved to ascend the cross, "That be far from thee, Lord," what was the reply? "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me, for thou savorest not of the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Suppose Paul had held his peace and not withstood Peter to his face before the Church, where had been our Christian freedom to-day? Or suppose that Luther, instead of manfully doing God's work, had contented himself with berating the times, what had become of the Reformation? If that disciple, whom Jesus loved, testified in his old age, "I wrote unto the Church, but such and such an one receiveth us not," we need not study popularity. In the long run it is easier to please Christ than to suit even good men. If we had more of the spirit represented on that seal, where the ox stands with a plough on one side and an altar on the other, and the motto, "Ready for either," there would be less of gloomy foreboding, and more of wholesome and hearty joy. It is the double-minded man, who is ever glancing at his own comfort, that is unhappy. Paul, when he said, "For me to live is Christ," was sorrow proof. The world has always hated God. The Church has always caused grief to its truest friends, from the days of Moses even until now; and so will it ever be, while there remains a world and the Church is not yet glorified. Often the servant of Christ will find himself like a soldier, left, by the retreat of his comrades, to fight alone. But he is not alone, for Christ abideth in him and he in Christ; and

if he be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, he will find his labor not in vain in the Lord, and the God of all grace who hath called him unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that he has suffered a while, will make him perfect.

ARTICLE VII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE LATIN VULGATE.

It was on the eighth of April, A. D. 1546, that "the sacred and holy, œcumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost," passed the following decree :

"Insuper eadem sacro-sancta Synodus, considerans non parùm utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus, quæ circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quænam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat ; statuit, et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et *Vulgata* editio, quæ longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur ; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat, vel præsumat."

"Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod, considering that no little utility may accrue to the Church of God, if, out of all the Latin editions, now in circulation, of the sacred books, it be known which is to be held as authentic, ordains and declares, that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the long usage of so many ages, has been approved in the Church, be, in public lectures, disputations, preachings and expositions, held as authentic ; and that no one is to dare, or presume to reject it under any pretext soever." [*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, Buckley's Translation.*]

The Latin Vulgate Bible, a compilation of translations by known and unknown authors, being thus crowded into the place of the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, as the text of common use, authority, and final appeal ; and being thus held and used by so large a branch of the Christian Church, it is of importance to know, in outline at least, its origin, history, and comparative purity. It is also a matter of no small interest to notice the beginnings of a book fifteen hundred years old, where

various hands, and without concert, furnished parts, and the *disjecta membra* came together by mutual attraction. Its increase till every part was supplied; the eliminating, substituting, and interpolating process, by which it was purified; its coming into favor over powerful rivals; its corruptions as it run the gauntlet of the ages, and its pious recensions; and finally, as an aggregation of translations, taking the place of the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,—these things make the history of the Latin Vulgate an exceedingly interesting memoir to the scholar as well as the Christian. The book has had a most eventful life, and came to its crowning after the strange adventures of a thousand years, when the Council of Trent ordained and declared the said old Vulgate to be supreme authority in the one Holy Catholic Church.

The prevalent language of the readers and writers among the Christians of the apostolic age was the Greek. Throughout the more civilized nations of the Roman Empire it was the language of literature, while in Greece, Egypt, and perhaps Syria, it was the language of common life. There is presumption almost to proof that the entire New Testament was given by inspiration in this language. The notion of some, that the Gospel according to Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews, were written originally in Hebrew, is greatly wanting in reliable data. And the Old Testament Scriptures, then in common use, were in this language. The most ancient version was the Septuagint, made by Alexandrian Jews, about 285 B. C. This was used by our Lord and his Apostles; one hundred and forty-seven of the two hundred and forty-four quotations from the Old Testament in the New being from the Septuagint. In the first two centuries this version was much used by both Jews and Christians, and so became imperfect through the mistakes of the copyists. Early in the third century, therefore, Origen undertook a revision. In his studies and travels, gathering materials for this work, which cost him the labors of twenty-eight years, he found six other Greek versions of the Old Testament; that of Aquila, of Symmachus, of Theodotion, and three anonymous. So generally did the early Church use the Bible in Greek. It was the text not only in the Greek churches, but for many years the Latins had no other.

But as the conquests of Alexander had carried this language through his vast empire, so the Romans, when they supplanted it by their victories, carried with them the Latin tongue. And so there slowly sprung up a demand for the Scriptures in that language. Before the close of the second century there was a Latin version. Tertullian made use of it, while he severely criticized some of its renderings. Lachmann, in his "Prolegomena to the New Testament," attempts to show that at first there was but one Latin version, originating in a Roman province in Northern Africa, whose capital was Carthage, and that what afterward appear as different versions are but variations and corruptions of this one. Eichhorn has this same view, whom Lachmann seems to have followed. The testimony of Augustine, however, is to the contrary. For, in his treatise on Christian Doctrine, he says that the number of those who translated the Greek Scriptures into the Latin cannot be told. For as soon as Christianity was introduced into any city or province, any one who had a Greek manuscript, and the knowledge to translate it, turned it at once into Latin. There is no evidence that any one before Jerome translated the entire Bible into Latin. One would render a Gospel, another an Epistle, another some other fragment of the holy volume; and so all was eventually translated. Then, to obtain an entire Latin copy, these fragments by different pens were united. By such a process we would expect to see many and varying copies, for no two would be likely to combine the same fragments, and when comparing one copy with another, attempts would be made to harmonize them by varying, amending, and interpolating.

And such was the fact. The copies and variations among them multiplied. And confusion was introduced, not only by the differing versions, but by the incorporation of marginal notes into the text through the carelessness of the transcribers.

And so the matter stood in the times of Augustine. Yet one version had gained the preëminence, of which this father thus speaks: "In ipsis autem interpretationibus, *Italia* ceteris præferatur: nam est verborum tenacior, cum perspicuitate sententiæ."

Concerning this version, that Augustine calls the *Italia*, there has been much discussion and investigation within the Romish

Church. They assume that it was made in the times of the Apostles, and possibly by one of them, and so has an authority equal to, or above, the original Hebrew and Greek. The other copies or versions, spoken of as extant in the times of Augustine, they regard as corruptions and variations from this one, and that for substance all the churches then had but one Latin translation, and that the *Itala*. And vast learning and labor have been expended, specially by the Benedictine brethren of St. Maure, to prove this theory of but one version, and to gather again its scattered parts, and set it forth in its integrity, and almost apostolic authority.

Prominent among the laborers in this field are Sabatier and Blanchini. The great work of the former was published at Rome in 1743, in three splendid volumes folio. Its one aim was to establish the point in question. The other was issued at Rome in 1749, in four volumes of the largest folio. But the labor was vain for the end sought, though these two vast works furnish much aid in correcting and using the manuscripts of the first ages.

Of course the Papal Church, having put the Vulgate in the place of the original Scriptures, is greatly interested to show that the translation, which they have thus exalted, came from a very ancient, if not apostolic pen. But their immense labors for this are a failure. Even Bellarmine admits that, "The Vulgar Edition hath not one author, but some things from Jerome, and some things from Lucian, and some things from Theodotion, and some things from another unknown interpreter." (De Eccl. Script. Lib. 2.) But though the *Itala* was thus preferred, as being a more literal translation, and truer to the sense, it did not exclude the inferior ones from use, or prevent their multiplication. For when Augustine would persuade Jerome to make an entirely new translation, he said, that the Latin Bibles in use were hardly to be endured, and that one would hesitate to quote any one as authority, they differed so much from each other.

Jerome, however, was not moved, at first, to comply with the wish of Augustine, but listened rather to Damasus, Bishop of Rome, (A. D. 366-84,) who requested him to publish a revision of the *Itala*. This he found to be no easy labor, from

the number of translations, and the variations among them. In his Preface to the Book of Joshua, he says, that there are abroad in the Latin Church "tot exemplaria, quot codices," — as many copies as manuscripts. And not only this, but, "unumquemque pro arbitrio suo, vel addiderit vel subtraxerit quod ei visum est," — every one had added or omitted what he pleased, in the different copies. He however gave himself to the work, beginning with the New Testament. Here he found passages of one Gospel inserted in another, and various other errors. These he corrected, to some extent, using the different Greek manuscripts, but confesses afterward, in the Preface to his Commentaries on Ecclesiastes, and in the Preface to the Pentateuch, that he did not correct all errors, or always give what he esteemed the best renderings, because he feared that too much innovation in the common readings would offend his readers, and make even his partial improvements useless. And this remark must cover both his revision of the *Itala*, and his own translation, made afterward.

From the New Testament he passed to the Old, and revised first the Psalms. This he did at Rome, and in a very hasty manner, correcting the common Psalter only where it differed widely from the Septuagint. This was afterward known as the Roman Psalter. After this he went to his retreat at Bethlehem, about A. D. 384, and undertook a more thorough revision of the Old Testament. In this work he used the Hexapla of Origen. The second revision of the Psalms thus made took the name of the Gallic Psalter, and was very much superior to the other. In the same manner he revised the *Itala* of the rest of the Old Testament. But of the fruit of this great labor he saved only his recension of Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles. The rest, he says in a letter to Augustine, were lost by treachery. These two Psalters of Jerome have a peculiar history, which will appear in fragments as we proceed.

The sad condition of the *Itala*, when Jerome undertook this work of revision, has been alluded to. A remark that he made to a friend, after the completion of the revision, will still farther show in what state he found it. "Rejoice that you receive the blessed Job safe and sound, who formerly, among the Latins,

lay prostrate in filth and worms." And in his Preface to the New Testament, in which he dedicates the work to Damasus, who assigned it to him, he says, "You impose on me the duty of producing a new book from an old one, since I was to sit as a judge on so many copies of the Scriptures scattered through the world, and decide which agrees best with the Greek."

The recension of the *Itala*, which Jerome accomplished with so much labor, was far from being generally acceptable. A simple, earnest, and unintelligent laity had associated the old version, with all its imperfections and corruptions, with the unalterable truth of God, and with their holiest and happiest Christian hours. They could not bear a change, or appreciate a reason for one. They rejected the improvements of Jerome, and made their piety to stand in their ignorance. Of such he often complains. In his Epistle to Marcellus, the 102d, he says, "They boast themselves to be disciples of fishermen, as if they were therefore holy, though exceedingly ignorant." And in his Preface to the New Testament, we find this prophetic lament: "When any one, learned or unlearned, takes up this volume, and finds that it differs at all from that which formerly pleased him, he will immediately cry out, that I have falsified, and committed sacrilege, who have dared to add, change, or correct anything in the ancient copies." And his sorrowing, querulous words to Paulinus, (Epistle 53, § 5,) indicate that thus early the popular will claimed the right to hold and teach, and watch for the purity of the Scriptures, against a tendency of the clergy to usurp all this to themselves. Evidently his own biblical labors had come under the coarser and overhauling hands of the laity. "All claim for themselves ability in the Scriptures, — the garrulous old woman, the simple old man, and the wordy sophist: all claim this; and they mutilate and teach the Word before they understand it. Some, weighing lofty words in their pride, philosophize on the Scriptures before insignificant women, while some learn from females that they may teach men." We notice here the germinating of that audacious dogma, now the strength and the curse of the Papal Church, that the right to have, hold, and teach the Holy Scriptures, is given of God to the clergy alone.

But while Jerome had yet incomplete his emendation of the *Itala*, he undertook a work of vastly greater importance. This was the translation of the Old Testament direct from the Hebrew. We can easily see how he was led along to this vast labor. In the preparation of his edition of the *Itala*, he had consulted the Hexapla. These six copies of the Septuagint, from which the *Itala* was made, showed many and great imperfections and discrepancies when compared among themselves, and when compared with the original Hebrew. The Latin copies were more abundant than the Greek, and more imperfect. The one he was commissioned to revise was exceedingly defective, while at the same time it was very popular. If he should emend and purify it thoroughly, conforming it to a correct Septuagint, and specially if he should conform it to the original Hebrew, where the Septuagint varied from it, the changes would be so radical and unpopular, that it would fail utterly of gaining a place as a standard in the Church. Hemmed in by these trying circumstances and discouraging probabilities, and restrained, too, by the instructions of Damasus, he attempted a compromise between a correct Bible and an unreasonable popular demand. His work, as he progressed, became more and more unsatisfactory to himself. He felt that in reality he was adding to, and taking away from, the words of the prophecy of this book. In such views and feelings many of his friends sympathized with him. And so, while this imperfect and unsatisfying labor was still in hand, he took the urgent counsel of many, and followed his own concurrent wish, and began a new translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. This was in the year A. D. 385; and he concluded the work after devoting twenty years to it.

He translated the Books of the Old Testament in the order in which his friends called for them, as may be seen by reference to his Prefaces to the Pentateuch, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. Nor do we find him yet fully released from the imperious will of the readers of corrupt translations. He still yields to their attachment to old readings, and is afraid of offending them. He confesses, in the Preface to his Commentary on Ecclesiastes, that he did sometimes follow an incorrect translation through fear of too wide a departure from the popular

one. And so we sometimes find that in his Commentaries he emends his own version.

But it must not be inferred that Jerome turned the whole Bible into Latin. He did not translate the New Testament. He revised it in his recension of the *Itala*; and so it now stands in the Vulgate, so far as that book has been kept pure from the hand of Jerome. He did not translate the Psalms. He revised them twice in the *Itala*, as we have seen; the first being the Roman, and the second the Gallic Psalter. The latter, says Baber, in his Introduction to Wiclif's New Testament, is "one of the most elegant productions of the age which gave it birth." It constitutes the Psalms of the present Vulgate.

Of the Apocrypha, Jerome translated only The Song of the Three Children, the Story of Susanna, and of Bel and the Dragon, Tobit and Judith. The other portions of the Apocrypha, as found in the Vulgate, are of the *Itala*. Jerome did not regard the Apocrypha as canonical, and evidently translated and revised what he did of constraint. In his Preface to Daniel, he says: — this Book, "as received among the Hebrews, contains neither the Story of Susanna, nor the Song of the Three Children, nor the Fables of Bel and the Dragon; all of which, as they are scattered through all the world, we have added, lest to the ignorant we should seem to have cut off a considerable part of the Book." And in his Preface to Tobit he remarks: — "I wonder much at the earnestness of your demand, for you require of me to turn into Latin a Book written in Chaldee, even the Book of Tobit, which the Hebrews have separated from the Catalogue of divine writings."

And so Jerome gave his version of the Scriptures to the world. Here we are presented with an anomaly in Church History. Here are two Latin versions of the Scriptures, one a recension and one a new translation, both candidates for popular favor, each the rival of the other, and both from the hands of the same man. Jerome offers his version to the Church, yet, preceding it, beside it, and above it, in popular estimation, there stands the *Itala*, as revised by his own pen. Both versions press their claims. One is supported by actual possession and common, though undiscerning favor, the other by merit.

The trial runs through more than two centuries. As in some

other cases of rivalry, original partisans and prejudices must be left to die out. A new generation, as a new jury, must be awaited, who will give verdict only on the true merits.

But it must be borne in mind that the two versions are not totally unlike. The New Testament is the same in both. The second revision of the Psalms, by Jerome, the Gallic Psalter, was also the same in both. All the other canonical books of the Old Testament, and the Apocrypha, so far as indicated above, were a fresh translation by Jerome.

The causes operating for and against the two versions should be mentioned, while we pass along to the close of the sixth and into the seventh century, and find that the translation of Jerome has supplanted universally the recension of Jerome.

It is a singular fact that what should have availed against the old and for the new version, had just the opposite effect. The old was a translation of a translation, the new was from the original Hebrew. The old, then, as from the Septuagint, must have been inferior to the new. Yet this fact was adverse to the acceptance of the more authoritative translation. For the Septuagint was in high repute in the Latin Church at that time. The legend of its origin was still credited, that each of the seventy-two translators of it, employed by Ptolemy Philadelphus, was inspired, and that each, in a separate room in the palace at Pharos, translated the entire Old Testament, without conference with any of the others, and that when the seventy-two came together, it was found that all the translations were perfectly alike, even to every word. The Septuagint, moreover, was the copy of the Old Testament generally used by Christ and his Apostles. From it they read and quoted to a large extent, as we have already seen. It must be added, too, that in the times of Jerome the Church had a great prejudice against both the Jew and his language; and so what was said to come from the Hebrew, or stand connected with it, was likely to obtain far less favor than its merits might claim. Even Augustine, while he esteemed the version of his friend as the superior one, feared to introduce it into the Church, and in all his works he never quotes from it. He thought it might be offensive in its variations from familiar readings, or distract and divide unlearned but devout men by diversity of copies, or make some

alienation between the Latin and Greek Churches, in the latter of which the Septuagint was the authorized version.

An incident in one of the African churches will show with how much jealousy the new version was received. When the word *hedera*, ivy, was read, according to Jerome, instead of *cucurbita*, gourd, as in the old version, in Jonah 4: 6, the congregation was greatly agitated, as by a panic. And we may still farther realize how sensitive the Latin Church must have been at the innovation of a new translation, when we remember how deeply the American Church was lately moved by the proposal of the American Bible Society to correct certain typographical errors and change somewhat the running titles in our common Bible.

Very like, the haste with which Jerome did his work may have added to the imperfections and unpopularity of his translation. He pressed his labors to a great speed and even rashness. For he gave but one day each to Tobit, and to each of the three books of Solomon. Still the version gained in favor by force of its inherent merits. It was copied and translated at once. While Jerome was yet working on it, a Spanish nobleman, Lucinius Bæticus, sent six copyists to Bethlehem to obtain a transcript of it. And Sophronius, who had solicited the translation of certain books, turned portions into Greek. Cassiodorus, a Calabrian, did much to multiply copies of the Scriptures, and among them the version of Jerome. He served ably as a statesman to promote the prosperity and repose of Italy under Odoacer and Theodoric and his successors, till the invasion of the Goths. In A. D. 542, he retired from public life, built a monastery, gathered about him a rare collection of books, and turned the labors of his monks to copying the Scriptures. It was a favorite maxim with him: "The transcriber inflicts as many wounds on Satan as he produces copies." He spared no pains to secure accurate copies. He would not allow the monks, though they clamored much against the rule, to amend or modernize the antique phraseology and orthography of rude and obsolete writings. And this anxiety for correctness was a principal cause of corrupting the version of Jerome. For he had it and the *Itala* copied in parallel columns on the same page, that the latter might be corrected, in use, by the

former. In this way the two versions became intermixed; and it was much labor, in after-ages, to separate and purify them. Indeed, this unfortunate compound formed to no small extent in the Latin Church the Vulgate of the Middle Ages.

In A. D. 604, Gregory the Great informs us that "the Apostolic See uses both versions." He, however, gave his approval and preference to that of Jerome. It then came into general use and received the title of *Biblia Vulgata*. The *Itala* soon passed out of use and of public possession, and in time perished as a book, those portions of it only being preserved that had been incorporated into the Vulgate by Jerome, and into the church-service and the authors of the earlier ages. From these scattered and imperfect sources efforts have been made to reconstruct the *Itala*. Sabatier made such an effort and the result was published in his great work of 1743 already mentioned. Gesenius in his "History of the Interpretation of Isaiah," informs us that Sabatier succeeded in restoring "three fourths of the whole book, 1000 verses, out of 1293," from the writings of those who had quoted Isaiah from the *Itala*, and prior to the version of Jerome. But he could not restore so much of any other book of the Old Testament, since none was so much loved, studied, and quoted by those early writers as this evangelical prophet.

And thus the Latin Vulgate as in part, a recension of the *Itala*, and in part a new translation from the Hebrew, and both parts at the hand of Jerome, came in the seventh century to be the only version of the Holy Scriptures in public use in the Latin Church. It had no longer a rival. It stood alone.

The fact that a different Psalter was used in some churches can hardly constitute an exception to this remark. The Roman Psalter has continued in use in the Church of the Vatican to this day, as also in St. Mark's at Venice. At Rome, however, the Gallican Psalter was introduced by Pius V. after it was authorized in the Vulgate by the Council of Trent, and continued for a time. At Milan one is in use, differing from both.

But the Latin Vulgate of Jerome has been the common Bible of Papal Europe since the sixth century. A translation of a translation, made at different times and by various hands, and

some of them unknown, emended, corrupted and revised, it came at last to supplant the original in the esteem and use of the Church.

ARTICLE VIII.

SHORT SERMONS.

"Not my will, but thine be done." — *Luke 22: 42.*

EVERY Christian has his Gethsemane, his place for the prayer of agony. And he cannot avoid the times when he must enter it with a soul "exceeding sorrowful." Perhaps the cherished project of years is melting away, and he is coming with inevitable step to stand where Job did when he said: "My purposes are broken off." Or his riches are taking to themselves wings. A blot is maliciously thrown on the fair picture of his life, and he cannot touch it for removal without making it worse. It may be that the premonition is given in language not to be mistaken, that his life is suddenly on its close. Perhaps the companion of youth and of riper years, of all joys and sorrows, is dipping the departing feet at the crossings of Jordan. Perhaps the first-born, in all the blush of her beauty and loveliness, or in all the rich prophecy of his coming usefulness and honor, is beckoned by an unseen hand, and prepares to go. Such are the hours when we foresee our crucifixion.

In such trial and agony, even to the full measure of his sorrow, it was right for the Saviour to pray: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." And so, blessed thought! it is right for us so to pray. We may, when "exceeding sorrowful even unto death," go to our Gethsemane. We may weep and groan under the grief, being in an agony. It is not wrong, for the Lord Jesus did so. We may kneel where he did, use his words, and tell all our anguish. Place and privilege sacred to sorrow by his usage! But we may not divide his words. We also must add that hardest word for human lips to articulate — "*nevertheless.*" O what a blank for God to fill out, having our signature in advance. The loved, the known, the hoped for, all cheerfully and sweetly yielded up in that one word, "*nevertheless,*" and the unknown will of God patiently and submissively awaited! And then the angels come ministering, as they did to "the Captain of our salvation," who was made perfect through suffering.

What a place is Gethsemane to learn and own the doctrine of the divine sovereignty ! Where in the wide world can one learn to pronounce with so much filial confidence and tenderness and sweet submission, the words, "thy will be done" ! He kneels where Jesus knelt. The cup is full to him, as it was to the Master. The waiting angel is there, as of old ; the identical one it may be. And after *that* prayer he can take up the cross. Yes, every Christian has his Gethsemane ; and it makes him Christlike to go there.

"For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." — *Romans* 7: 9.

By the "law," Paul meant the Ten Commandments, which he had, in all likelihood, learned when he was a boy, dwelling with his father and mother at Tarsus, and had had them at his fingers' ends ever since. Yet Paul says he had been "without the law." How was this ? Plainly, that he had understood nothing at all of its import ; had never seen and felt that it brought him under a hopeless condemnation, as a sinner deserving hell ; had never found out, and did not believe, that he was not able to keep all its requirements. Thus he was "alive" in his own estimation, that is to say, in a religious sense, or in relation to God. In the goodness which he possessed already, and his power of adding to it at will, he had, as he believed, a religious character which was, on the whole, sound and healthy, a good and sufficient foundation for his heavenly hope.

By and by the Spirit of God opened the eyes of his understanding, and showed him what the "law" was ; and he saw at once that he had never known anything about it before, — had been, to all intents and purposes, "without the law" ; and this discovery was as if the "commandment came" to him then for the first time. The effect was, that "sin revived": all the sinfulness of his life and character, that is, rose up to his astonished view in its fearful proportions, and he saw that he was a dead man, — guilty, helpless, condemned, — with not one good thing to plead before God in abatement of the sentence of condemnation that had already gone forth. Then Paul embraced Christ by faith, as he never would have done without that "law-work," and thenceforth he was "alive unto God."

Blessed is the man, and only he, to whom the commandment thus comes by the power of the Holy Ghost, disposing him joyfully to accept Christ as his righteousness, so that, "now being made free from

sin, and become servant to God," he has his "fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life."

"Lord, how secure my conscience was,
And felt no inward dread !
I was alive without the law,
And thought my sins were dead.

My hopes of heaven were firm and bright ;
But since the precept came,
With a convincing power and light,
I find how vile I am.

My God, I cry with every breath
For some kind power to save,
To break the yoke of sin and death,
And thus redeem the slave."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

A Historical Sketch of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts, from 1620 to 1858. With an Appendix. By JOSEPH S. CLARK, D.D., Secretary of the Congregational Library Association. Boston: Congregational Board of Publication. 1858. pp. 344.

DR. CLARK has had peculiar advantages for bringing together the materials composing this book ; and he has turned these advantages to good account in the production of a Work of standard value. He gives, in a single volume of convenient size, a brief historical sketch of all the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts for a period of 237 years ; from the Emigrant Church, which was formed at Scrooby, Nottinghamshire, England, in 1602, and which landed in Plymouth in December 1620, to the " Church of the Unity," South Boston, which was organized in November 1857. An Appendix contains historical matters of much interest, and two good indexes complete the volume, which will be found a very valuable book of reference. Such a mass of statistical materials, so well arranged and in so compact a form must have taxed even Dr. Clark's characteristic skill and industry in such matters pretty severely, and he is richly entitled to the thanks of every church whose origin is recorded in his " Sketch."

A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches. And the Churches' Quarrel Espoused; or A Reply to Certain Proposals. By JOHN WISE, A. M., Pastor of a Church in Ipswich. Fourth Edition. Boston: Congregational Board of Publication. 1860. pp. 245.

WE are here presented with two valuable treatises in one handsome volume. Together, they constitute the best exposition and defence of Congregationalism extant. Moreover, they possess a peculiar interest from the circumstance that their origin is traced to an important crisis in the early history of the New England Congregational churches.

The first in order of these two treatises was "The Churches' Quarrel Espoused," the origin of which is thus described in the introductory notice to the volume, by the Rev. Dr. Clark. "At a meeting of the Boston Association of Ministers, held November 5, 1705, sixteen 'Proposals,' which had been previously drawn up by a committee appointed for that purpose, 'were read and assented to,' and were put forth for the consideration and assent of 'the several associated ministers in the several parts of the country.' These proposals, though couched in plausible terms, and embodying some useful hints, were denounced by Mr. Wise as revolutionary — subversive of the Cambridge Platform, the then recognized 'Constitution' of these churches. His treatment of the aforesaid proposals is in the satirical form of a trial for treason, wherein they were severally found guilty and condemned to death. Never was a verdict more heartily rendered, nor a sentence more promptly executed."

The success of this effort encouraged Mr. Wise to undertake the "Vindication," which was first published some years later. Whoever would understand all the circumstances which have exerted a controlling influence in the Congregationalism of New England, must read this volume. It fully vindicates the author's claim to the eulogy in the closing words of his epitaph in the old burying-ground of Essex, "a star of the first magnitude."

The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records.

Stated anew, with special Reference to the Doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times, etc. etc. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, A. M. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 454.

HERE are eight Lectures delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit in 1859, on the Bampton Foundation. They are the testimony of

the Euphrates and of the Nile to the historical accuracy of the Biblical narrative. Auxiliary to two such witnesses, mysteriously summoned to confront infidelity in the court of truth, the Pagan, Jewish, and Christian writers, whose records are scattered through ancient literature, are freely introduced. The effort of Mr. Rawlinson is a masterly one to meet the German neologists and their disciples, prominent among whom are De Wette, Strauss, and Theodore Parker.

The Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Egyptian records, as more recently brought to light, are set forth with great power, and the agreement between Scripture and profane history conclusively shown. The whole manifestation of the volume is to the sceptics as the coming up from the grave of Samuel to Saul, after he had said, "God is departed from me."

A Dictionary of the English Language. By JOSEPH E. WORCESTER, LL. D. Boston: Swan, Brewer & Tileston. 1860. Quarto. pp. 1854.

WE subscribed for the splendid library edition, and have had it on our study-table, a daily aid and comfort, ever since. This well appointed copy of the trade-edition will lie at our editorial elbow, and will be the standard of orthography for the Boston Review.

The Benefits of Christ's Death: or, The Glorious Riches of God's Free Grace, which every true Believer receives by Jesus Christ and him crucified. Originally written in Italian, by AONIO PALEAREO, and now reprinted from an ancient English Translation. With an Introduction by Rev. JOHN AYER, M. A., Minister St. John's Chapel, Hampstead. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. pp. 160.

THIS is a remarkable little book, in its history, as well as in the subject of which it treats, and the scriptural and experimental manner in which the subject is treated. It is truly refreshing to be able thus to connect the plain doctrinal and practical piety of the present with the past. No Christian can read it without having his soul refreshed from the Fountain of Life, and the brief introduction will draw out his soul in deep sympathy with the martyred author, who was born about the year 1500.

The six chapters of the work are entitled: I. Original sin, and man's wretchedness. II. How the law was given by God, to the end that we, knowing our sin, and having not any hope of ability to make ourselves righteous by our own works, should have recourse to

God's mercy, and unto the righteousness of faith. III. How the forgiveness of our sins, our justification, and our salvation, depend upon Jesus Christ. IV. Of the effects of lively faith, and of the union of man's soul with Jesus Christ. V. In what wise the Christian is clothed with Jesus Christ. VI. Certain remedies against distrust.

In the Introduction we read: "Many are of opinion," says Vergerio, "that there is scarcely a book of this age, or, at least, in the Italian language, so sweet, so pious, so simple, and so well fitted to instruct the ignorant and weak, especially in the doctrine of Justification. . . . So great was its popularity, that forty thousand copies are said to have been sold in six years; and it was translated into several other languages." For being the author of this book he was seized by the Inquisition, conveyed to Rome, and after more than three years close confinement, he was condemned "to be suspended on a gibbet, and his body committed to the flames; though, according to some authorities, he was buried alive."

One of the charges on which he was tried was "that he ascribed justification solely to faith in the mercy of God forgiving our sins through Jesus Christ."

We think great good would be accomplished if this little volume were put into the hands of every member of our churches.

The Pulpit of the American Revolution; or the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776. With a Historical Introduction. Notes and Illustrations. By JOHN WINGATE THORNTON, A. M. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. pp. 537.

THE sermons are nine in number, between 1750 and 1783, and well selected. The publication is a lively illustration of the political preaching of those times. We commend to such as would know the tone of those days and of the volume, a passage in Mr. Mayhew's Preface to his Sermon of 1750, on "Unlimited Submission to the Higher Powers." "God be thanked, one may in any part of the British dominions speak freely, . . . both of government and religion, and even give some broad hints that he is engaged on the side of liberty, the Bible, and common sense, in opposition to tyranny, priestcraft, and nonsense, without being in danger either of the Bastile or the Inquisition, though there will always be some interested politicians, contracted bigots, and hypocritical zealots for a party, to take offence at such freedoms. Their censure is praise; their praise is infamy." The volume is a mirror of the Revolution, set in the pulpit. It shows

the causes, forces, and policies of the Revolution from a moral and religious stand-point, and so reveals the real secret of its success.

The value of the discourses is enhanced immensely by the introduction and notes of Mr. Thornton. The Sermons are a luxury and a lesson. We thank the compiler, annotator, and publishers for them most cordially.

Twelve Discourses. By HENRY MARTYN DEXTER. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, Lee & Co. 1861. pp. 219.

THESE are plain, earnest, godly sermons on the most practical themes of the Gospel. There is a simplicity and directness of style, and an easy, familiar, off-hand illustration, that must catch the popular ear. Compactness, terse logic, and demonstration do not here repel audience or reader who weary of much thinking. A living, every-day spirit animates each discourse. Popular objections are met by popular arguments, and the home-drift at the conscience and feelings is often powerful, or must prove so, if the hearer be previously well indoctrinated. The type, paper, etc., are admirable. The book tempts the eye and the hand, and no discourse in it is truer or better set forth than the portrait of the author on the opening page.

A Commentary, Critical and Grammatical, on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. With a Revised Translation. By CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, B. D., &c., &c. And an Introductory Notice, by C. E. STOWE, D. D. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston. New York. Philadelphia. 1860. pp. 183.

THIS thin and elegant octavo is another "proof and illustration" of the great strides which Scriptural exposition has made, in our language, since the days of Macknight and Doddridge. Like Bloomfield's and Alford's New Testament Commentaries, it gives the Greek text at the top of the page, with various readings where they can be of service; does not give the interminable and *exhaustive* (in more senses than one) prolegomena of some of the late expounders; and concludes the volume with a neat and beautifully chaste retranslation of the Epistle, by no means *à la Sawyer*. The notes are a fine specimen of the *multum in parvo* style of explanation; learned, ample, condensed, lucid.

Having had recent occasion to re-study a difficult portion of the

Galatians, we speak with the more confidence of this new arrival upon our table as a *real* helper of these investigations of the ever-living Word. We are glad to know that other volumes upon the apostolic epistles are to follow from the same accomplished hand. And especially are we pleased to find, that, while availing himself of whatever is good in German critical researches upon his subject, this author has not been poisoned by the lettered scepticism of that great laboratory of infidelity. We give an instance. Commenting on ch. 4, v. 24, he thus meets the attempts of "Meyer, De Wette, Jowett, to represent this as a *subjective*, that is, (to speak plainly,) an erroneous interpretation of St. Paul arising from his Rabbinical education." — "It would be well for such writers to remember that St. Paul is here declaring, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, that the passage he has cited has a second and deeper meaning than it appears to have; that it has that meaning, then, is a positive, objective, and indisputable truth." We are grateful to our commentator for allowing the Holy Spirit to give testimony as to what He really intended to say, while so many of these gentlemen seem to be very much in the condition of "certain disciples" who had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

BROCKHAUS of Leipzie has just issued a fac-simile page of the Sinaitic Codex, found by Tischendorf in 1859 in the Convent of St. Catharine at Mount Sinai. This contains the most of the Septuagint, and the New Testament, and is placed as early as the fourth century. It is the most ancient Codex known of the New Testament. It was presented by the Convent to their patron-head, the Emperor of Russia, and will be issued by him in four vols. in 1862. Tischendorf is now superintending the cutting of its uncial type at Leipzie. This Codex is without II John 5: 7, (the record of the three,) and agrees with the Codex Vaticanus in wanting Mark 16: 9-20 inclusive.

A LETTER in the *London Athenæum*, dated Jerusalem, Nov. 17, announces an important discovery, if true, of a very ancient MS. of the Pentateuch. It was found at Nablus, by Dr. Basilius Livishon of the Russian Episcopate at Jerusalem. He assigns it to the time of the First Temple.

If this be so, it will prove by many centuries the oldest known MS. of the Books of Moses, and its publication will be looked for with intense interest.

ARTICLE X.

THE ROUND TABLE.

OURSELVES. — The success of our enterprise and first number is beyond all expectation. Evidently we have come to the time and place for *The Boston Review*. This new candidate for theological and literary favor has met with a patronage and good will rarely equalled in the first issue of a Review. The voice of the Press and of the Church is emphatic and highly encouraging, specially when we remember that the theology of the *Review* is "antique," "fossil," "old foggy," "no longer extant," "behind the times," &c.

The Church of Christ welcomes this work; and laying aside any supposed modesty we may have as its managers, we offer a sample of the unsolicited commendations of it that we have received.

Says the *Congregational Herald*, of Chicago:—"A neater design for the outside title-page of a periodical than is presented on the cover, we have never seen; and the paper and print within correspond. To our great surprise we like the contents, abating a rather sour sentence here and there. The tone is more moderate, the style more racy, and the subjects more varied, than we had anticipated. In fact, it is quite a credit to those who issued it. It stands up manfully for true doctrinal preaching, as the staple of pulpit-instruction, and shows the danger of the ephemeral, sentimental, moralizing, lax, and mis-called practical preaching, now so popular in the churches, and so current in the newspapers. Go on, brethren, . . . you have our best wishes," &c. This is "good news from a far country," and so the more grateful.

Passing to the other side of the Union, the *Christian Mirror*, of Portland, says:—"This first number gives good promise." The *Congregational Journal*, of Concord, also gives us invigorating and encouraging words.

A venerable father in the Church, and who has done great service in the theological and educational world, writes to us:—"I heartily approve of your timely essay to do good, and encourage the older theology of New England, and infuse into the moral and social discussions of the day a more Scriptural element by the establishment of a *Review*," &c. "My old pen is nearly worn out, but I am yours with all good wishes."

Another writes us:—"I go in for sustaining, and handing down to posterity, 'the old apostolic faith.' I do not believe in any new-fangled theology. There is more difference between the new and the

old than between new and old wine, and I have it on pretty good authority that 'the old is better.'"

And yet another, among many comforting things, says:—"I like your first number very much."

The *New York Observer*, we are aware, is not supposed by some to have been started by Paul, or to be now edited by Timothy, though it dates back earlier than those Christian fathers, Eusebius and Irenæus. It speaks of the *Boston Review* as "orthodox, manly, Christian, valiant and good-looking." "The initial number has much of the right kind of thinking and speaking." It is a "spirited and trenchant Review." "It sets out with an array of facts to *prove* that it is high time the friends of sound doctrine are aroused to action."

One of the leading laymen in the centre of Maine, in a business-note, says:—"I have received the first number of the *Review*, and read the first Article, and think that alone is worth the cost of the *Review*. So I enclose," &c.

We hesitate much to add to these evidences of good will that the Church is volunteering, but must give a passage or two from a long and discriminating letter from one of the best divines in New England:—"I have just finished the reading, &c. It more than answers my high expectations. Perhaps my attachment to the old theology of the Apostles, as expounded by Calvin, the Westminster Divines, and Edwards, may render me unduly favorable in my estimate of a periodical whose pages, from beginning to the end, are pervaded with the savor of 'the faith once delivered to the saints.' The first article is worth a year's subscription," &c. "I am glad to see the *Review* make its first appearance, not only in a beautiful form as to mechanical execution, but in a style of literary taste not surpassed by any of our Quarterlies." "Some timid men may be sensitive about divisions that are to appear as the effect of such a Review. But I can see no reason to fear in this direction. I am led rather to hope that the free and faithful discussion of the Christian doctrines, in the manner to be expected in your *Review*, will promote harmony of views, and so cement the union of brethren in Christ."

The *Boston Journal* is so courteous that we must insert a word of theirs:—"It is got up in very beautiful style. It shows ability. The article about Theodore Parker is a model article. It will be all spicy, no doubt, possibly peppery. The *Review* will have a character, and a pretty decided one. Its utterances will be positive, and to the point. It will give no uncertain sound. We are glad of this, and the public will be glad of it too, for they have been hungering for something of the kind for a long time. We welcome it into the literary field, and wish it all success."

AMONG the wonderful discoveries relating to things "Edwardian," which philosophers have achieved in these latter days, the highest place will have to be assigned, we think, to the most recent; first published, so far as we are advised, in Boston, a few weeks ago, by the Pastor of the New York Tabernacle Church, in a Sabbath evening lecture before the Young Men's Christian Union. It would now seem that the most important works of Jonathan Edwards owed the characteristics which provoke the criticism of this luminous age, to the disadvantages under which they were written, and especially to his peculiar "humility," and his "ignorance of algebra, the higher mathematics, Greek classics," &c. Only think what Jonathan Edwards might have done, if he had known algebra and Greek, and had not been so extravagantly humble! Which humility, nevertheless, it is claimed, although it appears "extravagant to-day," ought not to be thought so very "strange," since, as we know, human nature has often developed into things equally extravagant in the opposite direction; as, for instance, that German philosopher who said, "I will create God"! Don't you think the pride of the philosopher was about as bad as the humility of the theologian?

We are also instructed, by this profound discoverer, that Edwards belonged to an "inelegant and inhuman" class of writers: hence the "vividness with which he portrays future punishment," which is declared to be a "grossness of expression" "not at all in accordance with our modern ideas of taste," and "wholly unsuited to our times." These "modern ideas of taste," it is said, forbid the preacher's "presenting the figures of the Bible in detail."

Did HE, who gave us the most startling of those figures, with reiteration and fearful emphasis, also belong to the "inelegant and inhuman" class? Would *his* preaching have been "wholly unsuited to our times"? Alas, we fear so! Can any prophet tell us whither we are drifting? We hardly know which to admire most, the magnanimity and brilliant knight-errantry of that voluntary surrender to a professedly free-thinking assembly, or the flippant and superficial trifling with the name and fame of Jonathan Edwards.

A NEW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. — We find the question on our Table, and pass it along, whether another school of the prophets is not needed. Many churches have great and protracted difficulty in obtaining a pastor who is fitted to their very peculiar wants and wishes. One church has very nice shadings, perhaps overcloudings, in its theology. Another is so given to practical godliness that it cannot receive any doctrinal preaching, like a pilot so intent on the prac-

tical duties of the helm that he cannot give any attention to charts and reckonings. Yet another church would captivate and convert (to pew-occupants at least) certain outsiders, who rank sermonizing among the fine arts, and the pulpit as a baptized lyceum. The circumstances of another church are very peculiar. They are surrounded by Arminians, Restorationists, Unitarians, &c. They would draw all these into a Broad Church Evangelical. A young man of popular talent, prepossessing appearance, (good *physique* we think the churches watching for pastors call it,) silent on doctrines, progressive, devout in attitudes and intonations, would answer their purpose. The First Avenue Church is destitute. Under the former pastor this church did nothing but sustain its regular meetings and the common charities of the day, make small and frequent additions to its numbers, and live a common Christian life. But they could not pay their pastor, and so sent him away. They want a smart young man, and are not particular about the salary. The Pilgrim Rock Church is in want of a man. During the presidential campaign their house was closed, except for the discussion of "great questions." "What must I do to be saved?" was not one of them. The Election is now over, the times are dull, and they propose to have a revival. Deacon Eli, one of the officers in this church, wants a man of great power, for his sons, Hophni and Phineas, give him some anxiety. They want a man who has always produced a revival in his six and twelve months' settlements. A new and fashionable church, in a growing place, feels the need of a man a little above medium size, dark complexion, heavy whiskers, and perhaps moustache. The latter point cannot be settled till after the next levee. If he have all but the moustache, and they settle to have it, they consent to close the house while he tarries at Jericho the time requisite. The Polygon Church wants a man so smart and so feeble, that he can preach but seldom. A pale, thoughtful recluse, who has strength to see only the principal families, and has a German reputation, would be preferred. If his health requires a trip to Europe while they shut up the church for six months, and pay his expenses, it will suit them, for "a good name is better than precious ointment."

It is proposed to found a Seminary that will furnish *custom-made ministers*. From four to eighteen months, according to the specialities in the order, would suffice to get up the article, while many a church has spent three years in hearing candidates and criticizing, and then got nothing but a minister of the Gospel.

It is an open question, whether or not to have any creed, even one "for substance of doctrine," in this new Seminary. For it is found

that a definite creed, as the Westminster, is a special hindrance to settlement. Yet nothing serves so well as a basis on which to beget confidence, funds, professorships, &c. But we leave the whole question open, as we found it.

MAY we show anxiety without being called "alarmists"? May we "tremble for the ark of God" without being accused of sowing discord among brethren? We find the following in the February number of "*The Monthly Religious Magazine*," a Unitarian organ, "edited by Rev. Edmund H. Sears and Rev. Rufus Ellis":

"A member of one of the large metropolitan orthodox churches sends us their creed. It is an excellent creed, every article of which we could heartily subscribe. Tripersonalism, the resurrection of dead bodies, election and reprobation, and *other dead traditions*, have been sloughed off, bringing this church into nearer conformity with the one Catholic Church of the Lord."

The creed is given. Among the "other dead traditions" "sloughed off," we find that total depravity is one; for of man's natural state it only says, "until renewed by the Holy Spirit destitute of the holiness required by the divine law," that is, deficient more or less.

We have no hint or notion what church this is. We know this, that its creed can have the "heartly subscription" of Unitarians. We want to express grief, anxiety, alarm. We want to mention some large metropolitan Unitarian churches that were once orthodox. We want to put in a plea for holding fast to "the form of sound words," against the introduction of creed-phrases, made to order, and of the most liberal and elastic and compromising accommodation. We want to bring out some old records, and compass and chain, and hunt up and reset certain ancient metes and bounds. But we must forbear. For so doing, we should stir a divisive movement among these brethren, create needless alarm, prove ourselves to be antiquaries, and hostile to all progress and "improvements in theology."

GOVERNOR ANDREW has presented to the State of Massachusetts the first military trophies of the Revolution—the gift of Theodore Parker, and won by his grandfather at Lexington. Was it a part of the official duty of His Excellency to eulogize, in the Message announcing the gift, the principles and labors of the donor,—a man who has done so much to dishonor the principles and labors of the Fathers of the Revolution? And must French Infidelity, beautifully finished up with Yankee veneers and varnish, thus be palmed

off under the Seal of the State? If so, then we beg leave to say, "God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

We would humbly suggest that His Excellency also make an occasion, while thus engaged in extra-official duties, to eulogize the deep reverence for God's Word, the strong doctrinal creeds, and the prayerful, holy life of those men who won trophies "in the sacred cause of God and their country."

WE must not omit to say, how deeply moved to grateful emotion we have been by the very encouraging notice of the *Congregationalist*. It gives at length our table of contents, and then saith as follows, to wit: First, we are "comely"; at which we blush with maiden modesty. Second, we exhibit a surprising "lack of strength, both of thought and of orthodoxy"; to which we say, good, as indicating an improved standard of thought and orthodoxy, where, in both, it is greatly needed. Third, we are capable of achieving a "respectable and influential position"; almost too much for our maiden modesty, considering its source; and, in addition to the "comely":

"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as others see us!"

Fourth, we may be expected to do "both good and hurt"; quantities, respectively, not given, but the sentence seems to read very much like a balanced account, or thus, plus six added to minus six, equal to nothing; — a mighty alleviation, as coming from a quarter where the bare apprehension of what we were going to do excited so much uneasiness beforehand. Lastly, there is mingled warning, fear, and prophecy, done in mingled mother-tongue and Latin, that, if we don't take care — the very thing which we mean to do — we shall come into "a dusty immortality upon the old pamphlet-shelves in the cellar of Burnham's great *per fugium librorum exanimorum!*"

The pathos of this last is so touching, that we are afraid somebody has got there already.

THE friends of the *Boston Review* will understand that this enterprise is not a personal interest, but that we have gone forward in it in compliance with the earnest entreaty of the friends of a staunch Puritan theology. We have no agents in the field. We do not intend to send out any, but must depend on those who love the old theology to see that our subscription-list puts us beyond all pecuniary anxiety.

Will not our brethren help the common cause by sending in at once a few subscribers each for the *Review*?